

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_121650
Title of the Manuscript:	Allium sativum: botanical, chemical, and therapeutic aspects
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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.	Garlic is an important vegetable used globally and this manuscript will provide a comprehensive overview of this.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it seems suitable	
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.	All good	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 methods and resources of scientific data are looking applicable and properly conducted. However, more research article could be included, if found appropriate. The conclusions drawn are supported by the data discussed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	References are not sufficient. More references should be included. Examples are 1. Hiramatsu K, Tsuneyoshi T, Ogawa T, Morihara N. Aged garlic extract enhances heme oxygenase-1 and glutamate-cysteine ligase modifier subunit expression via the nuclear factor erythroid 2-related factor 2-antioxidant response element signaling pathway in human endothelial cells. Nutr Res. 2016 Feb;36(2):143-9. doi: 10.1016/j.nutres.2015.09.018. Epub 2015 Oct 24. PMID: 26507778. 2. Liu SG, Ren PY, Wang GY, Yao SX, He XJ. Allicin protects spinal cord neurons from glutamate-induced oxidative stress through regulating the heat shock protein 70/inducible nitric oxide synthase pathway. Food Funct. 2015 Jan;6(1):321-30. doi: 10.1039/c4fo00761a. Epub 2014 Dec 4. PMID: 25473931.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality of the article should be improved	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Discussion Significance: "Provide a deeper and more critical discussion of the results and their implications in their own word with the background of facts and research content of this article." Pay attention to lines 277-278 which does not have author name "(2021) sought to isolate and identify the active compounds in garlic that have antimicrobial activity against <i>Streptococcus agalactiae</i> , a common cause of infections in pregnant women" Conclusion Content: "Include important information and key takeaways in the conclusion. Summarize the main findings and their implications for future research or practical applications."	

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:	Sukender Kumar
Department, University & Country	CBLU, India