

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_125525
Title of the Manuscript:	Ethnobotany, phytochemistry, pharmacology and therapeutic potential of Su'ad Kūfi (Cyperus rotundus L.): An insight
Type of the 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.	The manuscript sounds scientifically correct, medically informative and well-written.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript is suitable as it reflects all the keywords and whole summary of the manuscript.	
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.	Keywords actually tell the main concepts or ideas of a research paper, represented by words or phrases. We can simply call them the <i>search terms</i> . In this manuscript, only synonyms of <i>Cyperus rotundus</i> are mentioned. So, the keywords should be either the subheadings of your results and discussion section or the keywords you searched for (mentioned in Table 1).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In results and discussion section, geographical distribution should be just after classification. 2. In botanical description section, the macroscopic details of <i>C. rotundus</i> should start from stem, rhizome, leaves and then fruits. 3. Again, in results and discussion section the phytochemical constituents should be written before ethnobotany. 	
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.	Whenever we write a species name in taxonomical classification, there are both genus and species included according to ICN rules. Alone ' <i>rotundus</i> ' is called specific epithet. For example, Genus is <i>Cyperus</i> and Species name should be <i>C. rotundus</i> .	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient according to the demand of the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	It will be good if above mentioned minor revisions suggested will be corrected by the author(s).	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shaiphali Saxena
Department, University & Country	Government Post Graduate College, India