

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_EJMP_117825
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient, Phytonutrient Composition, and Antioxidant Activity analysis of Fresh and Cabinet dried Coconut (Cocos nucifera L.) inflorescence
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 1.7

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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Can be improved by putting use of its constituents in title</p> <p>Abstract must be well structured. Put material and method in abstract.</p> <p>It can be improved with expanding material method and discussion sections</p> <p>There is a need to put facts that support the implication of constituents in clinical scenario</p> <p>Its ok</p> <p>It is not clear whether this is a review article or an original article . In any case how many numbers of sample examined need to be mentioned. Mention the specific method used to derive quantitative results in table-4,5. Test tube picture need to labelled Clinical implications of plant antioxidant, phytochemicals and implication of its constituents must be discussed in discussion part with support of references.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, mentioned briefly in the abstract</p> <p>Yes, explained well in the reviewed manuscript</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>This is an original research article. As the test tubes are respectively placed in the order of tests I didn't labeled each. In the discussion part, I have mentioned and compared results with the available research done in <i>cocos nucifera</i> inflorescence. There is no much research articles on the Cocos nucifera inflorescence.</p>
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It ok</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>There has to be clinical implication of plant derived constituents with their validated method employed.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No