

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

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	For the scientific community, this manuscript is important since it provides a thorough analysis of the medicinal herb <i>Clitoria ternatea</i> , which has both traditional and contemporary uses. The presentation of comprehensive phytochemical profiles and pharmacological activities helps to close the gap between conventional wisdom and contemporary scientific investigation. I value the manuscript's comprehensive coverage of the plant's several use in agriculture, cosmetics, and medicine. To increase the manuscript's effect, I think it would be better with updated references and a more succinct structure.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Though instructive, the existing title " <i>Clitoria ternatea</i> (Aparajita): A Versatile Medicinal Plant with Diverse Benefits" should be more precise to highlight the plant's phytochemistry and variety of uses. A better title may be: "Phytochemistry and Multifaceted Applications of <i>Clitoria ternatea</i> : A Review of Its Medicinal, Agricultural, and Commercial Potential".	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive but could be more concise and focused.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	This manuscript provides a thorough analysis of <i>Clitoria ternatea</i> , emphasising its many commercial, agricultural, and medicinal uses. The plant's abundant phytochemistry, especially its cyclotides and anthocyanins, supports a range of pharmacological actions, including neuroprotective, anti-inflammatory, and antioxidant properties. Furthermore, <i>C. ternatea</i> exhibits promise as a natural food colouring and cosmetic, making it extremely valuable across a range of businesses. To overcome obstacles such as pigment stability problems and fully explore its potential in contemporary formulations like cosmeceuticals and nutraceuticals, more research is necessary. This review highlights this medicinal plant's adaptability and potential uses in the future.	
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's thorough analysis of <i>Clitoria ternatea</i> , backed up by several references from both conventional and contemporary research, gives the impression that it is technically sound and scientifically sound. Citing pertinent research and techniques like in-vitro and in-vivo models, it accurately depicts the phytochemical makeup and pharmacological actions of the plant. The claims of the plant's therapeutic qualities are supported by scientific evidence thanks to the use of peer-reviewed data. The article gains additional credibility from the thorough examination of the plant's economic uses as well as the references to extraction methods. Its scientific rigour would be improved, though, by making sure the references are current and the structure is obvious.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Including more recent references will make the manuscript more current and scientifically robust.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	No	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Neelima Yadav
Department, University & Country	Dr. C.V. Raman University, India