



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_61271
Title of the Manuscript:	IMPACT OF HERBAL MEDICINE USE ON ADHERENCE TO CONVENTIONAL ANTICANCER DRUGS.
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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI 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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>THE PAPER REQUIRED MINOR REVISION</p> <p>A - THE WORD IMPACT IN THE ABOVE TOPIC REQUIRED CRITICAL ANALYSIS BECAUSE OF THIS; THE TOPIC COULD BE CHANGED TO EFFECTS OF HERBAL MEDICINE.....</p> <p>B - ABSTRACT – THE AUTHOR SHOULD LET THE ABSTRACT BE IN A PARAGRAPH AND NOT IN SECTION.</p> <p>C - INTRODUCTION OR BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY -</p> <p>- THE SECTION SHOULD EITHER BE HEADED AS INTRODUCTION OR BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY AND NOT ORDINARY BACKGROUND</p> <p>- AUTHOR DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY WAS ACCURATELY STATED ESPECIALLY ON THE PROBLEM BEING INVESTIGATED IN COMBINATION WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY.</p> <p>D - METHODOLOGY – THE AUTHOR ACCURATELY EXPLAINED HOW THE DATA WAS COLLECTED VERY WELL, WITH NO REFLECTION OF THE USE OF QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS.</p> <p>PART OF WHAT THE AUTHOR SHOULD DO ARE:</p> <p>1.) THE AUTHOR NEEDS TO PROVIDE MAP OF MBARARA REGIONAL REFERRAL HOSPITAL ONCOLOGY UNIT IN THE DISTRICT OF UGANDA FOR EASY UNDERSTANDING BY THE READERS;</p> <p>2.) THE AUTHOR SHOULD ALSO USE ROMAN FIGURE IN PAGE 6 TO LIST MORISKY MEDICATION ASSESSMENT;</p> <p>3.) FROM PAGES 10, 11, 12, 13 TO 22; UNDER FIGURE 1 TO 4 AND TABLE 1 TO 6 WRITE THIS: SOURCE: FIELD SURVEY, 2020;</p> <p>4.) AGAIN IN PAGE 22 UNDER DISCUSSION OF RESULT – IN THE FIRST CITATION OF AUTHORS, THE AUTHOR MUST WRITE ALL NAMES OF AUTHOR AND THE NEXT CITATION OF THE SAME PAPER (AUTHORS), HE CAN THEN BE USING ET. AL. AND SO FORTH;</p> <p>5.) MOREOVER, AS A WRITER YOU MUST NOT ASSUME THAT ALL READERS MUST UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU ARE WRITING. THIS IS PERTINENT TO THE LAST PARAGRAPH IN PAGE 22 WHERE THE AUTHOR WROTE 34/39, 5/39, AND 2/39 CANCERS. THIS AREA NEEDS JUSTIFICATION AND CLEARANCE.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>6.) THE ANALYSIS SHOULD BE RE-EXAMINED BY A GOOD STATISCIAN.</p> <p>7.) THE CONCLUTION IS ALRIGHT.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>THE AUTHOR SHOULD DO THE CORRECTIONS STATED ABOVE BEFORE IT CAN BE ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Opatola Mustapha Olayiwola
Department, University & Country	Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria