

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_98819
Title of the Manuscript:	The Gambia and the right to Traditional, complementary, and alternative health care: A Legal Commentary
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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>The manuscript as a Legal Commentary is good, but it is only useful for the issue of health in the Gambia.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable.</p> <p>Overall, it is good. But the use of the first-person subject (I) is not conventional.</p> <p>Sectioning is good, but the content of the sections, for example, materials and methods, is not appropriate and sufficient.</p> <p>In my opinion, this manuscript is more suitable as a defence text for passing a law than scientific research. Variables, methods, and precise and appropriate tools have not been specified for it.            The references are good, but it is necessary to use similar researches in other countries or other similar reports prepared by researchers as examples and sources to increase the value of this manuscript.</p>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, I think it is suitable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The use of the first-person subject (I), which is used several times in the text, needs to be corrected.</p> <p>The amount of topics given in the discussion section is large and it is better to transfer some of them to the introduction section.</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)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Farzad Mirshamsi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran