

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_104022
Title of the Manuscript:	Ethnobotanic and Ethnopharmacological survey of herbal products of pharmaceutical importance for chronic wound management in Bankim District of Adamaoua Region of Cameroon.
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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Yes it is	
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)		
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is quite long. It could be shortened to read 'Ethnopharmacological survey of herbal products of pharmaceutical importance for chronic wound management in Bankim District, Cameroon'	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	The abstract is fair but the method section does not specify the processes of data collection. The author should provide a summary of the steps followed during data collection. The authorisation here may be reserved for the 'ethics' section in the main methods section in the body. The conclusion does not relate to the research. The author should state a conclusion of their finding in relation to products used to treat chronic wounds.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. Though the in the methods section the author should state the study design and the data collection tool; in the results section, the subsections should be numbered accordingly and appropriate references provided in the introduction and discussion sections.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes it is	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Some references are quite outdated like those of 199... if possible they could be replaced with more recent ones.	
(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)		

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fairly	
Optional/General comments	None	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rebecca Nakaziba
Department, University & Country	Lira University, Uganda