

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_122539
Title of the Manuscript:	ETHNOBOTANICAL STUDY OF MEDICINAL PLANTS IN KEPILASGADHI RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF KHOTANG DISTRICT, NEPAL
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<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>The manuscript presents a well-conducted study with significant potential for contributing to the field of ethnomedicinal uses of plants.</p> <p>While the study mentions the traditional uses of medicinal plants in Kepilasgadhi Rural Municipality, Khotang, Nepal, documenting medicinal plants used by local communities and expanding on the ethnobotanical background could add value. Discussing how the traditional knowledge aligns with the observed pharmacological activities could provide a more holistic view of the plant's potential as a therapeutic option if scientifically explored further.</p> <p>This manuscript seems like field statistical research of medicinal plants; it is worth investigating, but the manuscript needs to be revised before publication.</p> <p>Frankly, the authors collected information on the plants on informant and questionnaire basis, used by the locals, and made some categorizations. However, nominating and roughly identifying the herb is not enough; there are numerous herbal medicines around the world, and we should focus more on their activities in molecular or at least animal aspect, claiming the therapeutic effect experiences no scientific validation; that's the job our pharmaceutical and natural product researchers should do.</p> <p>Therefore, I suggest the authors analyze your information more deeply, then concentrate on herb-drug (s) effective against certain types of disease, and carry out phytochemical and pharmacological research to reveal its mechanism and material basis. If it is not possible, the author may quote the relevant study already published to justify the role of particular plants in specific diseases.</p> <p>The manuscript could benefit from a more detailed section on future research directions. This might include exploring currently marketed formulations using any of these 102 plants in the study.</p> <p>Also, in the introduction, the author has covered superficial information about regional description instead of providing a solid background of traditional uses of medicinal plants explored by the local community.</p> <p>The manuscript's current tone is too casual for a scientific publication. It should be revised to maintain a formal, academic style. Please ensure the manuscript adheres to the journal's formatting guidelines, including font, spacing, and headings.</p> <p>The manuscript should be written in a clear and rational manner, with logical flow and transitions between sections. Figures and tables should be cited in the main body with their respective places. Figure 1 and Figure 2 are not cited or discussed before they are placed.</p> <p>Reference no.20 is not appropriately written; kindly check all the references and arrange them as per journal guidelines. Addressing the above points could further strengthen the manuscript, making it more impactful and comprehensive.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 3

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.	Appropriate	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript should be written in a clear and rational manner, with logical flow and transitions between sections. Figures and tables should be cited in the main body with their respective places. Figure 1 and Figure 2 are not cited or discussed before they are placed.	
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.	This manuscript seems like field statistical research of medicinal plants; it is worth investigating, but the manuscript needs to be revised before publication.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference no.20 is not appropriately written; kindly check all the references and arrange them as per journal guidelines.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's current tone is too casual for a scientific publication. It should be revised to maintain a formal, academic style. Please ensure the manuscript adheres to the journal's formatting guidelines, including font, spacing, and headings. The manuscript should be written in a clear and rational manner, with logical flow and transitions between sections.	
Optional/General comments	Dear Editor-in-Chief, Thank you for entrusting me with the time to review this manuscript. After a thorough review, I have prepared and submitted my comments to enhance the overall quality and clarity of the work. I believe that the current tone of the manuscript is somewhat informal and could benefit from a more formal, academic style. This would align better with the expectations of scientific publications and contribute to a more authoritative research presentation. Additionally, addressing the specific comments outlined in my review would strengthen the manuscript's impact and comprehensiveness. By incorporating these suggestions, the authors can refine their arguments and provide a more robust contribution to the field. I appreciate the opportunity to respond to this manuscript and look forward to seeing the revised version.	

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:	Arpita Yadav
Department, University & Country	Bhagwati College of Pharmacy, India