

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_121049
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical Composition and Oxidative Properties of Moringa peregrina Dried-Ground Parts Extracted with Different Solvents
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores the antioxidant properties and chemical composition of Moringa peregrina, offering valuable insights for optimizing extraction methods. Its findings have potential applications in nutraceutical and pharmaceutical industries. I appreciate its detailed approach, though deeper data analysis and comparisons with existing studies would enhance its impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	A more suitable title could be: "Optimizing Extraction Methods for Maximizing Antioxidant Properties and Chemical Composition of Moringa peregrina for Nutraceutical Applications."	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Include key quantitative results, such as specific antioxidant levels or chemical composition findings.➤ Highlight potential applications of the findings in nutraceuticals and food industries.➤ Briefly mention the main extraction methods compared to give context to the results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Divide into distinct subsections for each extraction method to improve clarity.	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust, employing thorough experimental design, proper controls, and clear data presentation. These factors ensure the reliability and validity of the study's conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Its sufficient for this manuscript	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is suitable for scholarly communication but needs minor revisions for clarity and grammar.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is scientifically robust and well-structured, contributing valuable insights to the field.	

Review Form 3

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:	Roselin Jenifer
Department, University & Country	Sathyabama Institute of Science and Technology, India