

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JMSRR_119405</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ASSESSMENT OF HEAVY METAL AND MICROBIAL QUALITY OF FIVE HERBAL MEDICINAL CONCOCTIONS SOLD IN ANAMBRA STATE</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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/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></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Certainly, the manuscript is relevant for scientific community in the sense that the author employed scientific approach to assess the presence of heavy metals and microbial load in herbal medicinal concoctions which are already on the market.</b></p> <p><b>Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</b></p> <p><b>Indeed, the abstract is comprehensive.</b></p> <p><b>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are also appropriate.</b></p> <p><b>In my opinion, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p><b>The references are sufficient, however, some are old. The author should try and get similar articles which are current.</b></p> <p><b>Some comments have been highlighted in the manuscript, the author should address them.</b></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>Generally the language/English quality is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The author has done an applaudable work with this manuscript. However, I would suggest that the author pays attention to and rectify the minor errors highlighted in the manuscript. Where appropriate, the methodology should be in reported tenses as indicated in the manuscript</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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Nketia Anthony</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana</b>