

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_85829
Title of the Manuscript:	Piper nigrum and Morinda lucida possess antioxidant capacities and regulate the activities of key carbohydrate and lipid digestive enzymes.
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1) Supportive figures and graphs relevant to research work should be incorporated. 2) Tabular data should be more systematically explained. 3) Font size of entire manuscript should be same. 4) Abbreviations used should be stated before Introduction	1. This has been corrected with respect to Table 4 2. This has been addressed 3. Font size has been harmonized 4. Abbreviations have been defined
Minor REVISION comments	Minor mistakes in matter written under heading Preparation of the hydro-ethanolic crude extracts (Page no. 4) (Eg.: Tap water instead of Tape water, Electric Grinding Mill instead of Electric Grinding Mile, Whattman Paper instead of Whatman paper etc)	Corrections accepted and have been made in manuscript 1. Tap water 2. Electric Grinding Mill 3. Whattman Paper
Optional/General comments	References should be included from mainly last 5 years onwards (i.e. 2018 onwards)	I am sorry, only articles that were consulted are cited in this manuscript. Secondly if we have to look for new articles of 2028 upward, this will distort and take this manuscript out of context. Hence I prefer we maintain the manuscript as it is.

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)	No ethical issues here