

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_98816
Title of the Manuscript:	Herbal and Homeopathic Products Regulation in the Gambia: A Commentary on the Medicines and Related Products Act, 2014
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>)

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 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) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Herbal and homeopathic products are practiced by many traditional healers as well as patients by themselves. Thus, this is a widely discussed topic, and that's why the manuscript might be considered important for the scientific community. The title is suitable The abstract and introduction are written almost the same way. There should be more clarity. The structure is good. The manuscript is scientifically correct. References are ok.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is ok but this is preferred to avoid first-person in sentences.	
Optional/General comments	The abstract and conclusion may be rewritten to publish the view of the authors, not only quoting the Acts. In the discussion section, a lot of acts are written but no description is there about the significance of the acts relating to the article.	

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:	Nure Ishrat Nazme
Department, University & Country	Combined Military Hospital, Bangladesh