

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	

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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This is very good manuscript to understand the various potential popular herbal in the market whether it is suitable or matured for mankind to consume.</p> <p>Since there are doing only with 3 different kind of evaluation the title can be more focused to the supplement name rather too general.</p> <p>Abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>Structures are appropriate but it will be best if the author can put in a differential table of the 3 item for comparison or graph pattern of pythochemical differentiations.</p> <p>Scientifically the test done is acceptable and the author can do more on the potential nutrient contents also. Currently only author done with chemical component but with nutrient content, the entire component will be more valued.</p> <p>To be more on Quantitative each component must be kept and analyse in the same weight / or amount for testing purpose. This will avoid wrong chemical compounds calculations.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English quality acceptable.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sivakumaran Karupiah
Department, University & Country	Malaysia