

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_122620
Title of the Manuscript:	Obesity, Diabetes and Female Poly Cystic Ovary Syndrome (PCOS) Practices of different Herbal treatments in Khyber Pakhtunkhawa (KPK), Pakistan
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This article topic is good one and a burning problem these days	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title is suitable	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript do not look appropriate , There is no need to write objectives. Results and Discussion should be written separately.	
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.	Manuscript does not look technically sound due to reasons mentioned above, Even in results no statistics had been done.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes , references are sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality of the article is suitable	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anshoo Agarwal
Department, University & Country	Northern Border University, Saudi Arabia