

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_121301
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of anti-breast cancer and anti-oxidant properties of selected medicinal plants grown in Sri Lanka
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important to the scientific community as it provides new insights and expands our understanding in this area. It fills a significant gap in current research and presents well-founded data and robust methods that can serve as a basis for future studies. I appreciate the clarity and thoroughness with which the authors presented their results and made complex concepts accessible. However, I believe that the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed discussion of the potential limitations of the study, which would further strengthen its contributions.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>SCREENING OF BREAST CANCER ANTI-CANCER AND ANTIOXIDANT PROPERTIES OF SELECTED MEDICINAL PLANTS GROWN IN SRI LANKA</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the main objectives, methods, results and conclusions of the study. It provides a clear overview of the research, highlighting key findings and their implications. However, I suggest adding a brief mention of potential limitations or future research directions, as this would provide readers with a more comprehensive understanding of the scope and implications of the study. Additionally, if space permits, a sentence about the practical application or relevance of the results could increase the appeal of the summary to a broader audience. Major deletions do not appear to be necessary as the current content is relevant and well presented.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are well organized and appropriate, facilitating a logical flow of information. Each section is clearly defined, with a coherent progression from the introduction, which sets the context and objectives, to the methods, results and discussion sections. The subsections within each main section are well placed so that the reader can easily follow the development of the research. This structured approach not only improves readability, but also ensures that the manuscript adheres to standard scientific formatting, making it accessible and informative for the target audience.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound due to its rigorous experimental design and thorough data analysis. The authors used appropriate methods that are widely accepted in the field to ensure the reliability and reproducibility of the results. Furthermore, the manuscript shows strong agreement between the hypotheses, experimental procedures and conclusions, reflecting a clear and logical progression of scientific research. The use of advanced statistical tools further supports the credibility of the results and makes the manuscript a valuable contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include a mix of basic studies and recent research to ensure that the work is well-grounded in the existing literature. The inclusion of current references shows that the authors have taken into account the latest advances in the field, which increases the relevance of the manuscript. However, if the manuscript covers rapidly evolving topics or technologies, it might be beneficial to include some recent references to ensure comprehensive coverage of the current state of research. If important studies or reviews have been published in recent years that are consistent with the focus of the manuscript, these could be valuable additions to further strengthen the reference list.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scientific communication. The manuscript is written in clear, concise and formal academic language suitable for the intended audience. Sentences are well structured and technical terms are used correctly, making the content accessible to readers within the field. Although the overall linguistic quality is good, thorough proofreading can still be beneficial to catch minor grammatical errors or awkward wording that could be polished for even greater clarity and readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Relevance: The manuscript provides valuable insights into the anti-breast cancer and antioxidant properties of Sri Lankan medicinal plants, a pertinent topic with potential therapeutic implications.2. Ethical Compliance: Confirm that ethical guidelines for plant collection and research have been followed and documented.3. Disclosure: Ensure all potential conflicts of interest are disclosed.4. References: Verify that references are up-to-date and relevant; consider suggesting recent studies to enhance context.5. Language: Review for clarity and minor errors to ensure precision in methodology and results.6. Plagiarism: Confirm the manuscript has been checked for plagiarism and that all sources are properly cited.7. Structure: Assess if the manuscript is well-organized and if any sections require clearer presentation or reorganization.	

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:	Ashish Jaiswal
Department, University & Country	Career Point University, India