



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_29321
Title of the Manuscript:	ETHNOVETERINARY VALUES OF NIGERIAN MEDICINAL PLANTS
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	<p>1. Abstract Background: Author/s have not spelt the aim of the study Methodology: Author/s do not show how the data were collected Line 14-16 should go to results Results: Authors should show few of the identified plants and include lines 14-16 Conclusion: Weak need to be strengthened</p> <p>2. Background - the definition of the problem is not clear - the aim and objective of the study not clear</p> <p>3. Material and methods - Author/s do not show where the study was carried - Do not show the criteria used to sample the livestock farmers who were consulted - Line 56- 63 should go to result</p> <p>3. Results: - The author's do not show the number of the livestock farmers who were consulted and the distribution by socio economic levels - Author/s should show the identified medicinal plants - Author/s should include line 56-63 - Line 66 the word evolved I think should be</p>	<p>The aim has been spelt out.</p> <p>It is a literature review. It has been transferred to the result. Few plants have been listed. It has been strengthened. Check line 34 for definition of problem. Check line 46 – 48 for objective of the study. It is a literature review.</p> <p>Line 56 – 63 has been moved to “Result” It is a literature review. So that demographic information is not necessary. Some identified plants have been shown. Line 56 – 63 have been included</p> <p>“Evolved” has been replaced by “identified”. Thank you” the findings have been moved to “Result”. The relevant statements are supported by references. Line 101 – 108 has ref 94.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>replaced by the word identified</p> <p>4. Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This section is mixed up with the findings - there some strong statement but are not supported by reference <p>e.g. line 101 Some birds----- harmful bacteria line 105 Koala can----- most animals line 106 Ancient Arabs----- alfa alfa</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-	<p>Africa is indicated in line 32.</p> <p>The manuscript has been revised for better understanding.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The area of the study is relevant to the present situation especially in Africa where the financial resources are scarce to buy the veterinary conventional drugs. They are too expensive and our livestock farmers cannot afford</p> <p>The paper should be re-written so as the information presented can be read and understood by scholars who can go ahead for finding the most potent plants and make formulations</p>	