

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_108784
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF INVITRO ANTI-DIABETIC POTENTIALS OF BIOSYNTHEZIZED MgO NANOPATICLES FROM Vernonia amygdalina (BITTER LEAF) AQUEOUS LEAF EXTRACT
Type of the Article	Original

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Not enough. Results of the study should be presented clearly.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Most of the references are recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments: I thank the author(s) for putting together a wonderful research piece. However, there are some concerns in the paper that must be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The author(s) need to work on the Abstract. 2. Provide more details on diabetes mellitus in the introduction. 3. The method used for determination of phytochemicals, FTIR, XDR and SEM should be clearly stated in the methodology section for the purpose of reproducibility. 4. Interpretations of the results presented in tables and figures should be provided. Readers should not be left to figure it out on their own. 5. The discussion is poorly written. The author(s) should revise it and discuss the results obtained in line with previous research. 6. Conclusion should be appropriate with the study. 7. All abbreviations must be written in full with the acronym written in bracket before subsequent use of abbreviations. 8. General revision of the manuscript to correct sentence and grammatical errors should be done. 	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Odewusi O. O.
Department, University & Country	Afe Babalola University, Nigeria