



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_47123
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximate and Elemental Analysis of Three Medicinal Plants: Cuscuta relfexa, Cassia tora and Cassia fistula
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How the authors validated the method? 2. Is it routine elemental analysis of medicinal plants? If so, it is suggested that atleast provide dosage calculations and compare them with RDA values to increase the standard of the work. 3. Provide accurate errors in the elemental concentrations and round off all the values for eg: 25864.92 ± 5.05 as 25864±5 4. Avoid all general discussion on elements and provide how these levels will be helpful in cure the particular disease. 	
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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>G. J. Naga Raju</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, India</i>