

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_127378
Title of the Manuscript:	Tackling the Burden of Substandard and Falsified Medicines and Health Technologies in the wake of Poor Regulatory Environment in Somaliland and Somalia
Type of the Article	Research Article

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>		
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>		
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>		
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>		
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>		

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><b>Section: Abstract</b> The abstract exceeds the typical word limit of 200 words, which is recommended for clarity and conciseness. While it provides detailed context and highlights key actions taken by the Somali National Regulatory Authority (NRA) to address the problem of substandard and falsified (SF) medicines, it could be improved by focusing on the essential points and summarizing them succinctly. <b>Suggestions for improvement:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Avoid including excessive numerical details (e.g., sample numbers) unless they are critical to the message.</li><li>2. It lacks clear structure (e.g., the objectives, methods, and conclusions are not distinctly separated).</li></ol><b>Recommendation:</b> Reorganize the abstract into a more structured format, adhering to the standard abstract style, and limit the length to 200 words.</p> <p><b>Section: Introduction</b> The introduction effectively establishes the historical context and global significance of substandard and falsified (SF) medicines. It integrates well-researched statistics, case studies, and examples from credible organizations such as WHO, USP, and FDA to emphasize the scope and impact of the issue. This provides a comprehensive foundation for the topic and captures the reader's attention.</p> <p><b>Figure 1 - Caption Blurry:</b> The caption for Figure 1 appears blurry or unclear. This needs to be revised for clarity to ensure that the reader can fully understand what the figure represents.</p> <p><b>Figure 2 - Legend Invisible:</b> The legend for Figure 2 is entirely invisible, which makes it challenging to interpret the data presented. Ensure that the legend is properly formatted, visible, and legible, using a clear font and appropriate contrast.</p> <p><b>Incorrect Figure Numbering:</b> The figure numbering is inconsistent, as Figure 3 is also referred to as Figure 1 in the caption text. Carefully review the manuscript for proper sequential numbering of all figures and ensure consistency between the text references and the figure labels.</p> <p><b>Section: Methods</b> Recommendation: Specific sources of evidence (e.g., reports, surveys). Criteria for selecting literature or reports. How the WHO GBT was applied in the analysis.</p> <p><b>Final Thoughts:</b> <i>With above recommendation improvements, the manuscript will be well-positioned for acceptance. The changes are primarily editorial and structural, which means the core content is strong and impactful.</i></p>	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Pravin Vishwambar Dhole</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Marathwada University, India</b>