



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_48376
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional and Spectral Characteristics of Terminalia Plants
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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 subject studied is very important. Nevertheless, in the discussion of the results obtained no comparison with existing values. In addition to the version of the manuscript we received, there are missing tables and figures. This makes it difficult to judge the discussion. References must be consistent with the development of the SDI manuscript.	Apparently, there was a problem with the uploading of the documents with the Tables and Figures. They are now included at the end of the revised version of the ms. The results for <i>T. catappa</i> have been compared with those reported in the literature.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the method used to identify richer samples of macro and micro nutrients. I propose you to realize an ACP that could 2. There is work on <i>T. catappa</i> almonds or you can find polyphenol, macro and micronutrient values. 3. Insert tables and figures 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please note that the sentence was truncated. We assume that the reviewer was suggesting to conduct a principal component analysis. We conducted it for our data and the percentage of variability represented by the first two factors was ca. 65%. A new figure and some comments have been included in section 3.4. 2. A new and more thorough bibliographical survey has been conducted for <i>T. catappa</i> almonds composition, as suggested by the Reviewer. A comparison of values reported in the literature has been included in the results and discussion section, and new references have been added. Same applies to <i>T. catappa</i> TPC and Fla contents. 3. Tables and figures have been inserted at the end of the manuscript text. <p>* The typo in section 3.2 has been corrected (33100 mg/kg)</p>
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)	