

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJMP_84813</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Chemical composition and pharmacological activity of a propolis extract from Ecuador</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The manuscript concerns the analysis of the volatile fraction of propolis from Ecuador and selected pharmacological properties of the extract. <i>In vivo</i> studies of pharmacological properties are valuable.</b></p> <p><b>If the article is to be considered for publication, the authors must complete and clarify certain issues.</b></p> <p><b>In my opinion, the main problem of the publication is the use of only one sample of propolis. Authors should justify why this one sample was selected, was it preceded by any selection?</b></p> <p><b>What type of propolis did the tested sample represent?</b></p> <p><b>There is some lack of discussion in the part concerning chemical composition, were the identified compounds previously reported in propolis samples?</b></p> <p><b>Could the identified flavonoids not have a significant effect on the pharmacological properties? There is no literature data to indicate this?</b></p> <p><b>Some minor mistakes to fix:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Abstract: Results section: 25-38%</b></li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>-</li> <li>- <b>page 2, paragraph 2: versatility; diverse -&gt; diversified?</b></li> <li>-</li> </ul>	<p>Dear Referee,</p> <p>Thank you for your very careful review of our paper, and for the comments, corrections and suggestions. A revision of the paper has been carried out to take all of them into account.</p> <p>In Ecuador, different local producers offer propolis in the market, but many of them haven't been characterized chemically and pharmacologically. Considering the function of propolis in hives, propolis shows antibacterial activity, but not necessarily the pharmacological activities studied in this work. In the beginning of the investigation, we studied 5 samples of propolis, that are produced by local beekeepers and screening them using TPA model. Although all of them showed anti-inflammatory activity, the sample (analyzed in this manuscript) was slightly more active than the others. On the other hand, more compounds could be identified in the same sample. During the pandemia, we had restriction to work in our laboratory, so the possibility to analyse the pharmacological profile of other samples was significantly reduced. Nevertheless, in the near future we are planning to continue our investigation related to the other samples.</p> <p>Considering the chemical composition of the sample, it is not possible to rule out, that the sample belongs to red propolis, but it is similar to type III or yellow Cuban propolis. It is important to take into account that a main objective of the group of researchers is to collect more sample of local producers in order to study them and offer a particular classification for Ecuador. The type of propolis that it could be possible to belong the studied sample was included in the manuscript.</p> <p>As the reviewer suggested the relationship between chemical composition of the studied sample and compounds identified in other propolis was included in the manuscript.</p> <p>As the reviewer suggested, more information about chemical composition and its relationship with the pharmacological activity was amplified. Also, more references was included in the new version.</p> <p>In abstract: Results section: 25.38% represents the sum of the percentages of the Beta amirone (0.57%), ((3-beta) -lanosta-8,24-dien-3-yl) -oxi (1.60%), Beta amylin (5.80%), Alpha amylin (4.58%), Triterpene isomer of amylin ( 2.21%) and 9,19-Cyclo-9-beta-lanostane-24-on-3-beta-iloxil (10.62%)</p> <p>In page 2, paragraph 2: versatily was changed by versatility diverse was changed by diversified</p> <p>In page 6, paragraph 1: elucidate was included in the manuscript</p> <p>As the reviewer suggested the fig 1 was improved</p> <p>As the reviewer suggested a linguistic revision was done</p>

Review Form 1.6

	<div>-</div> <div>- page 6, paragraph 1: elucidate</div> <div>-</div> <div>-</div> <div>- Fig.1: Could you provide a better resolution image of larger size?</div> <div>The entire manuscript requires a thorough linguistic correction.</div>	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	