

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_84726
Title of the Manuscript:	PHYTOCHEMICALS AND ANTIMICROBIAL EVALUATION OF <i>Tapinathus bangwensis</i> Leaves
Type of the Article	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Provide the GC-MS chromatograms. If not in the main body, attach as supplementary materials.-Indicate the specifications of all the solvents and chemicals used-Write the scientific names correctly.-Provide a supplementary information to the chemical structures of the reported compounds-The molecular mass reported in Table 3 should not be rounded off to whole number as this reflects the resolution of the instrument. As currently presented, the GC-MS result appears to be poorly resolved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- GC- MS Chromatogram provided as an Appendix- Specifications of solvent indicate- Scientific names written correctly- Supplementary information about the chemical structures provided- Molecular mass in table 3 not rounded off to a whole number
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">-Scientific names are not correctly written-Column headers of Table 1 should be edited so that it can be easily read-Why does the precision of the percentage yield report differ? One decimal place for extract and butanol but two for hexane and EtOAc. Did the analyses differ in the methods? If not, consistency is important.-The quality of the tables can be improved. The texts on columns 2 and 5, Table 2 are not properly spaced. The molecular formulas are not correctly presented (i.e., subscripts).-the row header for Table 2 should appear on the next pages of the table.-See manuscript for typographical errors (highlighted in yellow)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Scientific names written well- Column headers of table t edited- Decimal place of the yield extract corrected- The quality of the tables improved
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	