

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_107422
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbiological status and Pharmaceutical Evaluation of Commercially Available Herbal Medicinal Products in Lagos, Nigeria
Type of the Article	RESEARCH

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst the initial response could be that this study is indeed important to the scientific community, there is the concern that it is far too generic in nature and largely devoid of new insight (taking into consideration that novelty per se is not a requirement). Yes, the title is aligned with what the study intended to address. I would rather say it is adequate as it does not entirely comply with the requirements of being comprehensive. Yes it is. Mostly. However, it is a well-know fact that such products as used in this study lacks quality control in the manufacturing process (as stipulated by the authors this is due to the absence of standardisation practices). No, they are neither sufficient nor recent. It is a big concern that no relevant literature from the last 7 years were used (most recent source dated 2016). This immediately questions the validity of the arguments presented. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	No, it is not, there are far too many spelling errors and sentences that are poorly constructed.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Table 1: description not aligned with its contents; Under results and discussion: line six has a reference that was omitted; There is an urgent need to include recent scientific information in this manuscript. This will most probably result in a complete redo of the literature review as well as the arguments presented in the discussion of the results.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ljc Erasmus
Department, University & Country	University of Limpopo, South Africa