Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Medicine and Health**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJMAH_117008**
Title of the Manuscript:	**EVALUATION OF ANTI-UROLITIASIS ACTIVITY BY TITRIMETRY METHOD AND AGGREGATION ASSAY**
Type of the Article	

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**1. The manuscript is an interesting manuscript that is important for the scientific community. However, all botanical names were not properly written in italics, the results and discussion section needs major revisions, the tables in this section were just highlighted without any mention of them in the manuscript.** **2. The title is not suitable – alternative title - ANTI-UROLITIASIS ACTIVITY OF SELECTED PLANT EXRACTS BY TITRIMETRY METHOD AND AGGREGATION ASSAY** **3. Abstract not comprehensive, does not include the result, brief discussion and conclusion at all.** **4. The subsections and structure is alright but major work needs to be done on the result and discussion section, all diagrams in the manuscript also should be relevant to the work and should be referred to in the manuscript.** **5. I think it is scientifically correct, however the tables in result and discussion contain absorbances, these can be converted to concentration as appropriate** **6. The references can be more robust. There are several sections in the manuscript where references are required**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The English language is good but can be better,	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Tomilola Debby Olaolu**
Department, University & Country	**Tulane University, School of Medicine, USA**