



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | European Journal of Medicinal Plants |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_EJMP_45379 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of methanolic extract of Ocimum gratissimum on blood pressure, some electrolytes, renal and cardiac biomarkers in 8% NaCl induced hypertensive male wistar rats. |
| Type of the 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 | In section 4.0 – Discussion, the in-text reference needs major revision. The minimum correction will see the inclusion of the year a reference author reported the findings. Naming the author alone without indicating the year or that it is a report is deficient. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>Line 9 – the author is advised to change “possessed” to “possesses”</p> <p>Line 16 – the author is advised to use either “from 0-4 weeks” and from “5-8 weeks”. “For” is not applicable in this context</p> <p>Line 39 – change “drug” to “drugs”</p> <p>Line 42 – the author is advised to use “an antihypertensive” not “antihypertensive”</p> <p>Line 44 – the author should please remove “used as vegetable”</p> <p>Line 82 – the author is strongly suggested to complete the sentence. It is incomplete.</p> <p>Line 270 – Use “Variance” not “Variance”</p> <p>Under Section 2.1 – Plant Extraction, the author is advised to include the authentication number of the plant as initialled by a certified botanist in the University herbarium or similar official. This will give credence to the authenticity of the plant.</p> <p>Under Section 2.6 – Biochemical assays and procedures, there is no need to describe the methodology in details. The name of the technique, author, year and reference for the technique is sufficient.</p> <p>Under section 2.7 – Statistical analysis, did the author run a normality test before subjecting the data to the chosen statistical tool? if not, then the author is strongly advised to do so.</p> <p>I am of the opinion that several tables could be merged together. For example, Urea, Creatinine and Electrolytes may be lumped into one table. If the author is not satisfied, please indicate with a rebuttal letter indicating your stand.</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | A good research work. However, it could better be justified with more references from WHO and several authors on the need to research on medicinal plants. | |

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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | <i>Sharafudeen D. Abubakar</i> |
| Department, University & Country | <i>College of Health Sciences, Nigeria</i> |