

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_76756
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical, Biochemical and Biological Evaluation of Five Herbal Bitters Sold in Pharmacy Shops in Eastern Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Title – According to my viewpoint, title is well written</p> <p>Abstract – I think this abstract is OK.</p> <p>The author made a great use of tables, charts, figures if relevant. Tables were used to comprehensively report specification and results, and the figure were used to visualize the results in a manner that allowed the reader to draw their own conclusions. So, the data are public and thus allow for independent verification of the results. All these aspects of the paper were appreciated. However, you must name your figures in a proper way.</p> <p>Contents seems to be good enough.</p> <p>The text is generally well written. But I had some comments about streaming the writing in my general review. Normally, use italic option to type botanical names. Therefore, you must rewrite all the scientific names in reputed way and concern your grammatical issues. Most of the sentences have grammatical errors. You can use “Grammarly” like academic software to correct and improve your grammars.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Always concern paper formatting. Font size, font type and other fundamentals are needed to improve. Use should same font type throughout the article. It will help to maintain uniformity of your article</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Overall, this is an interesting study. You must improve drawbacks to success of your article. However, in my opinion the paper has some shortcomings regarding some data interpretation and text, and I feel this unique data collection has not been utilized to its full extent. Although, the writing was at tomes redundant and other times too minimal. Therefore, this article is not balance in its contents. I summary, I think this is a good effort that will make an important contribution to the research field.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	G.V.P. Samaranayake
Department, University & Country	Gampaha Wickramarachchi University of Indigenous Medicine, Sri Lanka