

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_87509
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant, antimicrobial and phytochemical investigations of cone of Thuja orientalis
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalejmp.com/index.php/EJMP/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The authors presented a research manuscript investigating phytochemical screening, and antioxidant, antibacterial and antifungal activities of <i>Thuja orientalis</i> cone. The pharmacological activities of <i>Thuja orientalis</i> cone has not been reported so far, thus making this manuscript has some values. Overall, the authors found that <i>Thuja orientalis</i> cone exhibited modest antioxidant activity, comparable antibacterial and antifungal activities against certain bacterial strains and fungi as compared to the three standards. The authors should address the following before considering for publication acceptance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title – it should be edited to truly represent the manuscript, where phytochemical screening should appear first, and antibacterial and antifungal should be stated. 2. English language writing – there many grammatical and sentence errors, as well as punctuation misuse. Also, some typos, particularly Figure 1A (concentration) have been identified. Please check thoroughly. 3. Abstract – the future perspective's sentence should be edited by using general words rather than mentioning "antidiabetic, etc". 4. Introduction – it is too should. The authors should add in the importance of identifying new antibacterial and antifungal agents from natural sources. 5. May I know how did the authors determine the single concentration of three antibiotics (e.g., Ampicillin (2µg/ml), tetracycline (30 µg/ml), penicillin (2 µg/ml)) for antibacterial and antifungal assays? 6. In Results and Discussion – an in-text citation is required for "The methanol extract of cone revealed the presence of terpenoids, alkaloids, tannins, flavanoids, saponin, and phenols, which are known to have antioxidant, antibacterial, and antidiabetic properties". The authors should mention which bacteria are gram (+) and gram (-), and the extract are superior against which type of bacteria. May I know why the authors only tested with methanolic extract? Specifically, why did they only choose methanol solvent to do extraction? 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Wu Yuan Seng
Department, University & Country	Sunway University, Malaysia