

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_88899
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Physiochemical properties, thermal behavior and phytopharmaceutical potential of Citrus aurantium's essential oil
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>In the manuscript, entitled" Evaluation of Physiochemical properties, thermal behavior and phytopharmaceutical potential of Citrus aurantium's essential oil" studies provide the phytochemical and antibacterial properties and thermal stability of essential oil extract from Citrus aurantium's plant blossoms.</p> <p>Overall, the findings are interesting and draft written is considerable. I have concerns more from the methodology applied and explained in the draft.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What is the source of the bitter orange plant. The stage when it was plucked or taken out for the study should be indicated. Whether it was fully blossom and starting to blossom. The authors should give complete details about the raw materials used. Whether the authors died if after collected or not, cleaned using rinsing with water or alcohol. Was it immediately subjected to distillation or kept open for hrs before extraction?2. How many cycles of hydro-distillation were used. How much amount of the plant blossoms was used.3. How much of the oil obtained? What was the yield or % yield of the product.4. What was the concentration used for the further experiments. The authors mention that the concentrated extract was reconstituted. Please mention the dilution amount used.5. How many replicates of the extract were used for each experiment/study or just single sample extract was taken into consideration.6. For antibacterial activity, how many serial dilutions were used. Did they used mixed bacterial titer or individual bacterium titer. How they concluded the MIC for each bacterial titer.7. In antibacterial activity analysis, the vehicle used 5 % dimethyl sulfoxide solution (DMSO) with 0.1 % polysorbate-80 (1 mg/mL) would have impacted the antibacterial effects. Did the authors do comparison of antibacterial activity of the oil with the vehicle treatment.8. The have mentioned that the oil is effective at low concentrations. Please be specific to write that it is effective at low concentrations for the specific bacterial titers. Likewise, the authors should review the other statements throughout the results.9. Please discuss the limitation of the study.10. Please discuss the limitations of the use of the plant extract.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The draft must be checked for typo and grammatical errors.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deepali Gupta
Department, University & Country	Birla Institute of Technology and Science, India