

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>European Journal of Medicinal Plants</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJMP_122128</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comprehensive Review on the Formulation Development and Pharmacological Potentials of Euphorbia hirta</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community by providing a comprehensive review on <i>Euphorbia hirta</i>'s formulation strategies and pharmacological potentials. The listing of the bioactive compounds, therapeutic applications, and formulations highlights the potential of the plant especially in areas where access to conventional medicine is not accessible or is limited. This review not only reinforces the relevance of <i>E. hirta</i> in contemporary medicine but also paves way for further research into its clinical applications.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The current title is clear, but I suggest "Pharmacological Potentials and Formulation Strategies of <i>Euphorbia hirta</i>" as a more suitable alternative. The term "development" in the original title is somewhat unclear and could be misleading. Additionally, I recommend omitting "comprehensive review" from the title, as the content, while thorough, leaves room for further exploration and detail on certain aspects.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, however, there are some areas where it could be improved such as including a concluding sentence that underscores the significance of the review, such as its potential impact on future research or the development of new therapeutic agents.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript follows a logical structure, starting with the introduction and progressing through historical background, botanical description, phytochemistry, pharmacological properties, and formulation strategies. However, some subsection titles could be more descriptive—for example, renaming "Evolution parameter" to "Evaluation Parameters for Formulations." Additionally, combining similar sections would improve clarity; specifically, "Formulation Strategies and Applications" should incorporate the content on ointment and mouthwash formulation currently under the "Extraction,..." section. Moreover, adding a separate "Discussion" section to address the limitations of the current research, explore potential applications, and identify areas for future study would enhance the manuscript's depth and completeness.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive analysis of <i>Euphorbia hirta</i>, supported by a wide range of references. The manuscript demonstrates a thorough understanding of the bioactive compounds and their extraction methods, linking these to relevant pharmacological activities. Furthermore, the detailed exploration of formulation strategies reflects a high level of technical precision, making the review both informative and valuable for future research in this area.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript appear to be comprehensive, covering various aspects of <i>Euphorbia hirta</i>, including its traditional uses, phytochemistry, pharmacological properties, and formulation strategies. However, I suggest for additional references</p>	

**Review Form 3**

	especially recent reviews or meta-analyses or systematic reviews published within the last 3-5 years. Also references from recent studies that focus on innovative formulation strategies, especially those employing new technologies.	
Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jinky Marie T. Chua</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cagayan State University, Philippines</b>