

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_103176
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the phytochemical composition of some commonly sold male herbal fertility supplements in Port Harcourt, Rivers State.
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:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The peer-reviewed scientific work is devoted to the topical issue of modern phytopharmacology. The means of correction of male fertility described in the work are common in use, and the elucidation of the mechanisms of action of these means is impossible without a pharmacognostic analysis of their composition. The disclosure of these questions by the results of the authors' research indicates the practical significance of this study and the interest of readers after its publication.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is controversial, because the expediency of indicating geographic data remains unclear from the research results. It is not known whether these plants, which are part of the pharmaceutical composition of male sexual function correction products, were obtained from a specific area, or whether they are unique in terms of botanical origin. Instead, the presentation of the obtained results in the form of a comparative analysis would allow the authors to systematize the obtained data and present them in a more successful way. I offer the authors a choice of two directions for correcting the title of the work: first, focusing on the researched means, with an indication of their commercial names ("Comprehensive analysis of the features of phytochemical composition of preparations "Libron Herbal", "Mascum Herbal Pride" and "Energy 3000"); the second – after editing the main results of the study by means of a comparative analysis, indicate that the work has an important analytical value (for example, "Comparative pharmacognostic analysis of herbal remedies for the correction of male fertility").</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article fully reflects the results obtained by the authors. However, it is desirable to paraphrase the first sentence, because it partially coincides with the Introduction section. In addition, it is desirable to present the results not according to the quantitative content of individual components in different means, but to indicate them by combining common substances and singling out those that are excellent in their phytochemical composition.</p> <p>4. The structure of the article and its subsections meet the current requirements of the journal. As a wish, I would once again point out to the authors the expediency of presenting the research results in the format of a comparative analysis. This will significantly improve the perception of the obtained results and allow to evaluate the possible pharmacological activity of the studied drugs.</p> <p>5. Research methods and devices used by scientists prove a methodologically sound approach to performing scientific work. Therefore, I consider this manuscript to be scientifically correct, and the results obtained are well-founded. A logical question arises, what was the expediency of the conducted experimental studies, because the drugs used in them are commercial and widely produced by the pharmaceutical industry. Is there no information about their composition in the instructions for use? Or are the performed studies part of post-registration monitoring?</p> <p>6. Of the 33 references in the work, one is repeated twice, and another six (19%) are outdated, so it is better to replace them with more modern scientific articles.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The work is written in professional English, but needs to be corrected by a native speaker.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In the Introduction, it is desirable to indicate information about the pharmacological activity, toxicological parameters and the prevalence of the use of these phytopreparations.2. In the Materials and methods, it is necessary to specify whether the work was carried out at the initiative of the authors or within the framework of a scientific grant/project. And how were samples of drugs for research obtained.3. It is desirable to publish information about a possible conflict of interests of the manufacturers of these drugs and the authors of the article.4. It would be interesting to learn the possible mechanisms of correction of oxidative stress as the leading pathogenetic factor of male infertility with the use of these drugs.	
----------------------------------	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Koshevoy Vsevolod I.
Department, University & Country	State Biotechnological University, Ukraine