

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_83270
Title of the Manuscript:	Preparation of Angiotico-2 (A-2) an Electrohomeopathic Herbal Remedy, its TLC, FTIR, Pharmacognocological, Phytochemical, Chemical, Heavy metal, Pesticide, Food Additives and Microbial screening for safety usage.
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The abstract should be well written in a standard format.2. The paper should be checked for grammatical errors.3. The title of the paper is too long. It should be concise.4. The abstract and introduction are not reflecting the contribution of the paper.5. The caption of the tables should be properly rephrased.6. Equations should be well labelled.7. A typical model system or block diagram showing the structures involved in the study is required with detailed parameters and conditions of operation.8. The results in tabular form should be represented graphically.9. The discussions in the paper should be expanded and well explained to bring out the contribution.10. The conclusion is not complete. Kindly check the last sentence.11. The references are limited and obsolete.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Abstract restructured and edited2. Checked for grammatical errors.3. TITLE CONCISED4. Corrected abstract and Introduction to reflect the contributions of the paper.5. Table captions are properly rephrased.6. Equations are labelled according to GHP7. Not applicable8. Results in tables can't show in graph because it is test of a medicine9. Discussions are rewritten10. Conclusion is corrected and last sentence corrected11. References are limited in the Electrohomeopathic scientific literature
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	