



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_48539
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical and Mineral Characteristics of SaponaceousPlants
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>)



SDI 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The topic should read “ Evaluation of the phytochemical and mineral characteristics of some selected saponaceous plants”. 2. Aims in the abstract should be adjusted to aim. 3. The common names of the plant species used in the study should be written in front of the scientific names. 4. The scientific names mentioned in the abstract have only generic names but no specie names. The scientific names should have both generic and specie names. 5. The aim written at the end of the introduction is not an aim. It does not make meaning. Please, write out a concise aim for the research. 6. Remove the line drawn under leaves and kernels in line 40. 7. The outlines for all the parameters collected during the research are too shallow. Please, explain in step by step detail how each parameter was analysed not in summary. 8. The manner in which the statistical analysis is not correct. What statistical tool was used to analyze your data? Is it ANOVA, chi-square, T-test? Consult literature for proper reporting of the section. 9. Incorporate Tables and Figures in appropriate sections in the results and discussion segment. Let not stand alone. 10. Subject Tables 3 and 4 to T-test to determine significant differences between treatments. 11. Some figures in the manuscript have no titles. Please, input the titles of the figures. 12. Please, make compulsory grammatical corrections in the entire manuscript. 13. Arrange the manuscript according to the specifications given by the journal. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript need to be rearranged into specifics to enhance understanding.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good work by authors but poor arrangement.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Liamngee Kator</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Benue State University, Nigeria</i>