



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | <u>Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</u> |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JOCAMR_33087 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Survey of Ethnomedicinal importance of plants used in the managements of diseases in Irepodun Ifelodun Local Government Area, Ado-Ekiti, Southwest, Nigeria. |
| 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>Please kindly rewrite this abstract. a synthesis should be made to sticks to the most relevant information and avoid repeting statement. e.g. "Azadiracta indica and Alstonia boonei were frequently</p> <p>Please check the whole ms for typos. e.g joint words; Line 30: kayode vs Kayode</p> <p>Lines 30-33: This sentence is not complete. Although.... Plaese address.</p> <p>Lines90-104: Please, provide well ordered formula in the text.</p> <p>Discussion: Though the authors presented their findings, no atttempt was made to discuss the results obtain with previous findings especially when it came to the reported ailment with regards to plant use (e.g. was it the first time that plant X was reported for the treatment of a given disease?). I therefore recommend the authors to provide to discuss their finding with regards to previously published works.</p> <p>It is not clear to me if the authors obtained ethical approval or followed a specific agreement for the conduction of the survey. Please clarify the situation. What is the guaranty that the investigated community will still have ownership of their indigenous knowledge?</p> <p>Please clarify the ethical issue if any.</p> <p>The author did not mention any ethical approval received to conduct the study in the targeted community</p> | <p>Some corrections were made on the abstract. However the whole abstract was not re-written as demanded, but the author ensured that the abstract was edited to answer the stated objectives of the study. Joint words and some other typographical errors were edited and corrected as applicable.</p> <p>Line 30-33 and others were identified and corrected accordingly. Formula stated under the materials and methods were properly and correctly stated.</p> <p>Also, discussions were re cast and findings were supported with other literatures by various researchers.</p> <p>Ethical approval was obtained and it has now added to the materials and methods.</p> |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | | |