

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_84813
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical composition and pharmacological activity of a propolis extract from Ecuador
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 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The article presents a very interesting and relevant topic. In general the article is well written and with important information on the subject. However, the authors need to explain some points below:</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>- Why was methanol used in the extraction process? The authors must justify the choice, mainly due to its toxicity;</p> <p>- Authors should better explain the derivatization process used and explain why they performed this step;</p> <p>- Authors need to make use of the retention index in order to improve the identification of compounds. Identification by mass spectrum alone in gas chromatography may be insufficient. At least the retention rate should be used to improve identification assertiveness. In this case, the programmed temperature retention index (LTPRI) of van den Dool and Kratz can be used. This is the main questioning point of the work, as the identification process may be compromised since the authors did not use standards for positive identification and did not use the retention index.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>- In the first paragraphs of the introduction, the authors do not cite the references used;</p> <p>- It would be interesting for the authors to include the geographic coordinates of the sample collection point;</p> <p>- In the experimental part, in the chromatographic part, the authors must specify other relevant information such as: injector temperature, ion source temperature, carrier gas;</p> <p>- The resolution and axes of figure 1 should be improved;</p> <p>- Authors must show the complete chromatogram;</p> <p>- References used in the work need to be updated.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jaderson Kleveston Schneider
Department, University & Country	Instituto de Tecnologia e Pesquisa – ITP, Universidade Tiradentes – UNIT, Brazil