



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript serves as a survey of the medicinal plants used in Ekiti State, Nigeria which are used in treating diseases with the aim of identifying their abundance status. The content and scientific depth of the manuscript is narrow and some of the information is lined up in a poor manner. Thus, it is with deep regret that the manuscript is rejected, but nevertheless, should the deficiencies be rectified, it can be re-submitted for consideration. The following reasons are highlighted when arriving at this decision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The language used throughout the manuscript needs significant revision. It should be thoroughly vetted by a native English language speaker.</li> <li>2. The use of parenthesis for citations in the main text is incorrect on several occasions. For e.g. lines 36–37 the parenthesis at the beginning of the references is missing; line 44, '(Springob, and Kutchan (2009)' is incorrect.</li> <li>3. The introduction is not sufficiently specific for the premise and study of the manuscript. There is no clear reason and rationale for the study, and this is a significant void.</li> <li>4. What was the questionnaire which was used? A sample should be included in the manuscript, at least as supplementary information.</li> <li>5. Whether the study was done in CRD or RBD is not very clear. From the aspect of statistics, this is a significant piece of information which has been left out.</li> <li>6. The Results and Discussion is a not enough interpretation of the outcome. The authors should consult a proper statistician who is able to provide in-depth analysis of the survey data.</li> <li>7. The reason for selection of the survey area is not included, and should have been rationalized in the very beginning.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	None	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	None	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Viduranga Waisundara</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rajarata University of Sri Lanka, Mihintale, Sri Lanka</b>