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	**The manuscript concerns the analysis of the volatile fraction of propolis from Ecuador and selected pharmacological properties of the extract.** ***In vivo* studies of pharmacological properties are valuable.** **If the article is to be considered for publication, the authors must complete and clarify certain issues.** **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?** **What type of propolis did the tested sample represent?** **There is some lack of discussion in the part concerning chemical composition, were the identified compounds previously reported in propolis samples?** **Could the identified flavonoids not have a significant effect on the pharmacological properties? There is no literature data to indicate this?** **Some minor mistakes to fix:** - **Abstract: Results section: 25-38%** - **page 2, paragraph 2: versatility; diverse -> diversified?** - **page 6, paragraph 1: elucidate** - **Fig.1: Could you provide a better resolution image of larger size?** **The entire manuscript requires a thorough linguistic correction.**	
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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Michał Miłek**
Department, University & Country	**University of Rzeszów, Poland**