

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_SARJNP_98816</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Herbal and Homeopathic Products Regulation in the Gambia: A Commentary on the Medicines and Related Products Act, 2014</b>
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://journalsarjnp.com/index.php/SARJNP/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>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>	<p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>no</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of English is poor and needs major corrections.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grammatical, punctuation and spacing errors in the commentary are highlighted throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>The word lacunae need not be in italics and needs to be corrected throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>The sentence "In this commentary, I examine the role of the new Act on herbal and alternative medicinal products in the Gambia" can be re-written as "In this commentary, the role of the new Act on herbal and alternative medicinal products in the Gambia has been discussed with respect to the product regulations."</li> <li>The objective in the introduction part of the commentary requires major revision by realigning the areas of interest concerning the article.</li> <li>Lines of abstract and introduction seem to be similar and require correction.</li> <li>The methods section needs a major modification with a proper protocol of the literature search.</li> <li>The discussion part of the article is irrelevant to the aim of the article. Various definitions have been mentioned which are not required. The authors are requested to stick to the literature which is specific to the aim of the study. Hence, I would suggest that the discussion requires major revision with more elaboration on previous studies, explanation of the relevant act.</li> <li>Limitations, shortcomings and the advantages of the new act in the commentary are to be highlighted. The novelty of the act is to be mentioned.</li> <li>The conclusion part of the commentary requires revisal and elaboration.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Jaideep Mahendra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Meenakshi Ammal Dental College &amp; Hospitals, India</b>