|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Book Name: | **TRADITIONAL & NATUROPATHY REGULATORY FRAMEWORK IN AFRICA: A Comparative Analysis** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_BPR\_3013** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **TRADITIONAL & NATUROPATHY REGULATORY FRAMEWORK IN AFRICA: A Comparative Analysis** |
| Type of the Article | **Complete Book** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 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.** | The manuscript fills a significant gap in understanding the legal structures that support or hinder the development of alternative and traditional medicines in Africa.  I appreciate the manuscript for its detailed exploration of a topic that is often overlooked in global health discussions. Its focus on comparing different legal systems and providing recommendations for improving regulations is both practical and necessary for advancing healthcare access in Africa. The thoroughness of the research, including region-specific case studies, adds depth to the analysis and highlights the diversity of approaches across the continent. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title of the article, "Traditional & Naturopathy Regulatory Framework in Africa: A Comparative Analysis," is informative but could be made clearer and more engaging to better reflect the depth of the manuscript. It could be revised to make it more specific about the scope of the analysis and the implications of the regulatory framework for public health.  Here’s an alternative suggestion:  **"Regulatory Frameworks for Traditional and Naturopathic Medicine in Africa: A Comprehensive Comparative Study"** |  |
| 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. | **NOT APPLICABLE.**  **IT’S A BOOK NOT A MANUSCRIPT** |  |
| **Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** | **Overall, the structure could be improved by:**  Organizing regional analysis more systematically.  Adding a conclusion and methodology section.  Consolidating redundant sections for a more fluid narrative. |  |
| **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.** | **The author systematically examines the legal frameworks in different regions, relying on policy documents,** healthcare laws, and ministerial directives, which strengthens the credibility and relevance of the findings. The document demonstrates a clear understanding of the legislative gaps and their impact on healthcare outcomes, providing evidence-based recommendations for improving regulatory structures. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.**  **-** | The references in the manuscript seem to cover a broad range of sources, including policy documents, healthcare laws, and academic literature, which is appropriate for the nature of the study.  Some references, such as those from WHO (2001) or other older documents, may need updating. Given that healthcare regulations can evolve, it would be beneficial to include more recent sources from the past 5-10 years to reflect current legal and policy changes in African countries regarding traditional and naturopathic medicine. |  |
| Minor REVISION commentsIs the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | There are occasional grammatical errors and awkward phrasings, which could be refined. For instance, ensuring subject-verb agreement and proper use of articles.  Ensure that terms like "naturopathy," "traditional medicine," and "complementary medicine" are used consistently throughout the manuscript to avoid confusion.  A thorough proofreading or professional language editing would enhance the quality, ensuring that the manuscript meets the expectations of scholarly communication |  |
| Optional/General comments | **Areas for Improvement:**  Structure: The manuscript would benefit from a more streamlined structure, particularly by adding a dedicated methodology and conclusion section. Consolidating redundant sections could also improve clarity.  Recent References: Incorporating more recent references and data would enhance the manuscript's relevance, ensuring it reflects current legislative developments. |  |
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