



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_50746
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of Polyphenols and Mineral Contents in Three Medicinal Weeds
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	This manuscript is good in its contents and composition, only needs a little improvement	We thank the Reviewer for his/her positive feedback. The changes suggested in the minor revision comments section have been addressed.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Weeds, in keywords better change to be medicinal weeds. Keywords are usually arranged in alphabetical</p> <p>In row 69, tanning acid, should be tannic acid In row 77 the title should not be separated from the contents, you should move it to the next page In row 91, This table should be on one page, the contents of the table are written in letters smaller than the text</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the keywords, "weeds" has been replaced with "medicinal weeds", as suggested.</li> <li>- Keywords have been re-arranged in alphabetical order, as recommended by the Reviewer.</li> <li>- The <i>lapsus clavis</i> ("tanning acid") has been corrected, and it now reads "tannic acid". We thank the Reviewer for bringing this to our attention.</li> <li>- The title of the Results and discussion section has been moved to the next page, as indicated by the Reviewer.</li> <li>- The extra spacing added to Table 1 rows has been removed, and it now fits in a single page. Font size of the contents of the table has been reduced, as suggested.</li> </ul>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	There are 8 from 30 references out of date (over ten years)	The information available in the literature on these weeds is limited and the selected references, in spite of the fact that some are older than 10 years, are relevant. Hence, we consider that they should not be removed from the ms.

**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)	N/A