



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>I have read the article entitled "ETHNOVETERINARY VALUES OF NIGERIAN MEDICINAL PLANTS" in which the authors described a survey of ethnoveterinary plants that would be potentially used to treat animal diseases. My first impression is that the work has a good scientific intention. However, several aspects related to the format of data acquisition and presentation should be revised. Also, the text of the discussion is too superficial and lacks bibliography to give support to the authors claim. In most cases, the text of the discussion is out of focus and does not bring consistent argument about the issue. Overall the work lacks a rationale. The major concerns are listed below:</p> <p>Materials and methods section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- If livestock farmers were involved in the survey the authors should present the authorization of an ethical committee for such an interview. 2- Also, the authors should present in Methods section a questionnaire and describe which literature was employed to elaborate the questions. 3- Between lines 56-63, the authors explain how the plants are given to the animals and which active principle are the most common. This seems to be a result and not a method and 	<p>I thank you for this commendation.</p> <p>Data acquisition was from literature search. I don't believe the discussion is superficial and lacks bibliography. The discussion alone has 37 citations. However, I have improved on the discussion and bibliography. The rationale of the work is to provide the medicinal plants of ethnoveterinary values.</p> <p>Livestock farmers were not involved. But there was a few verbal communications.</p> <p>Since farmers were not involved, no questionnaire was administered.</p> <p>Lines 56 – 63 have been moved to the "Result".</p> <p>Farmers were not recruited in the study. It is a review work. Results can be presented in tabular form.</p> <p>Thank you for this information.</p> <p>The information from the references have been included in the work.</p> <p>Ref 85 in line 99 and ref 94 in line 104 are</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>should be moved to the Results section.</p> <p>Results section</p> <p>1-Besides the usage of tables, the authors are recommended to present the results as a percentage. For example, they could do different bar graphs including the ethnic groups of farmers, species of plants in percentage, the animals that are supposed to be treated with those plants, active principle if the plants were submitted to a phytochemical analysis, type o diseases most treated and the respective plants and so on;</p> <p>2- There are several ethnopharmacological surveys in literature that could help the authors to ameliorate the treatment of the data. Please see in the works of: Soraes et al. Medicinal plants with inhibitory properties against snake venoms. Curr Med Chem. 2005;12(22):2625-41 and Parthiban et al. Quantitative traditional knowledge of medicinal plants used to treat livestock diseases from Kudavasal taluk of Thiruvavarur district, Tamil. Revista Brasileira de Farmacognosia 26 (2016) 109–121. Nadu, India</p> <p>Discussion section</p> <p>1- As cited above the discussion lacks objectivity and a rationale. For example, in lines 99-101 the authors say “The plant also protects gorillas from fibrosing cardiomyopathy which has a devastating effect on captive animals” but they do not present bibliography to give support.</p> <p>2- There are several other affirmations in the text of the discussion with the same problem. Please see at Page for lines 121-136; Page 5 lines 137-141;</p>	<p>sufficient for the citation.</p> <p>Line 121 – 136 and 137 – 141 have been moved to “Result”.</p> <p>Quindine has been corrected.</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The text should be careful revised in order to prevent typos. For example, page 5, line 160 the Word quindine should be corrected to quinidine.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The English must be revised Ethical issue: If the authors have made interviews with native people they should present the authorization of ethical committee for such an activity.	English has been revised. No interview, so ethical issue is not relevant in this context.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		