

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_110804
Title of the Manuscript:	Antihyperlipidemic Bioactivity Guided Isolation and Structural Elucidation of Isolated Phytoconstituents from Convolvulus pluricaulis Choisy.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Antihyperlipidemic bioactivity-guided isolation and structural elucidation of plant components isolated from <i>Convolvulus pluricaulis</i> Choisy were evaluated. The subject is important with the steps it can take in the field of health, and expanding research in the field is always valuable. It would be more beneficial to optimize the article title. A short, clear and focused title that suits the purpose of the article can be added. Alternative title suggestion: <i>Convolvulus pluricaulis</i> Choisy: Bioactive Component Characterization and Antihyperlipidemic Effect The summary of the article provides information about the overall study. It would be more appropriate to simplify the detailed explanations given in the summary section and remove additional information. Ingredients section is missing. All chemicals and equipment used must be included with details (brand, model, city and country of origin). All protocols applied in the "Material and Methods" section should be fully cited. How was the dose of Triton WR-1339 chosen? Could lower or higher doses be preferred? How were the doses of <i>C. pluricaulis</i> determined? It was stated that both female and male albino rats were used in the study. Why was such a choice made? Couldn't it have been done on a single gender basis? Why were the values for both genders not given separately? Where were (Swiss) albino rats purchased/obtained from? I consider it a study that has potential but also has shortcomings. The analyzes were not supported by graphics. A significant portion of the data is descriptive or confirmatory in nature, but their functional significance has not been addressed. The correlations in the discussion section fail to draw attention to the innovations in the article. Throughout the article, very old sources have been used. It is important to replace these resources with more up-to-date resources from an innovative perspective. Additionally, there is a lack of references in the method section. The discussion section is seriously lacking. The author especially needs to discuss the phenomenon of the study with current sources. In general, it must be said that the visual expressions are also weak. The analyzes were not explained effectively. By correcting such deficiencies, the article will become more useful. Triton WR 1339 (400 mg/kg): doi.org/10.1002/ejlt.202300105 <i>C. pluricaulis</i> (400mg/kg): doi.org/10.1016/j.jaim.2020.06.011 <i>C. pluricaulis</i> (200mg/kg): doi.org/10.1111/jphp.13004 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. It needs to be carefully edited with technical English editing expertise, with particular attention to English grammar and sentence structure.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Esra Palabiyik
Department, University & Country	Türkiye