



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_53124
Title of the Manuscript:	Root bark of Cordia millenii essential oil: anti-inflammatory and anti-nociceptive activities
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	Classical study is focused on the pharmacological activity of essential oil isolated from root bark of <i>Cordia millenii</i> . The work was designed to evaluate the anti-inflammatory and anti-nociceptive activities of this essential oil. The methodology and discussion inclusive used statistical analysis of received results are described clearly and comprehensively without objective and formally serious flaws. Received information are correct and scientifically robust. Only some discrepancies predominantly of formally character have appeared – see the yellowed notices in the text of manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	Small discrepancies of formally character appeared – for more details see yellowed notices directly in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Simple and well written the manuscript with small discrepancy only – see above. I recommend the manuscript in this form for publication. However, a small formally revision is recommended.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miloslav Milichovsky
Department, University & Country	University of Pardubice, Czechia