

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_126003
Title of the Manuscript:	Clitoria ternatea (Aparajita) : A Versatile Medicinal Plant with Diverse Benefits
Type of the Article	Review Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	A review like the one presented here is always very useful because it brings together much information which one would otherwise have to search in the vast literature. The manuscript is well organized and covers a great number of different aspects of the medicinal uses of Clitoria ternatea	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title covers the content of the article quite well.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	After reading the abstract I had a feeling of knowing what the paper was about. And after reading the paper I found that the Abstract was pertinent and to the point.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes – the paper is very well organized and it is easy to find the information one might be looking for.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript appears scientifically correct. I did not check all the references against the text, but when reading the text nothing appeared strange or out of the way.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The number of references is fine. One could always add more references, but in a review the limits must be set at one point, and what we are presented with here appears comprehensive and coherent around the questions asked.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript could benefit from a critical. Editing. The English is mostly good, but there are a few glitches here and there. There are also some minor things such as starting a sentence with an abbreviation, which in my teaching is not acceptable. And after the authors name in the citations there is often a period (.) before the comma (,) and the years. And also I think that in good English numbers between one and ten should be spelled out in running text. The number of illustrations of the chemical compounds also appears a bit overdone..	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Henrik Balslev
Department, University & Country	Aarhus University, Denmark