

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_70491
Title of the Manuscript:	IN-VIVO ANTIBACTERIAL AND SYNERGETIC EFFECT OF GARLIC (ALLIUM SATIVUM LINN) AND WATER LILIES (NYMPHAE LOTUS LINN) EXTRACTS ON MULTI-DRUG RESISTANT ENTERIC BACTERIA
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please add plants' information in your introduction and why you choose these two plants in this study. 2. Author did not describe the source of plant material. This is very important to know where are the plants come from. Please state specimen voucher. 3. How author prepare the stock of plants extracts? What is the method of extraction? 4. Please state the details of standard environment condition. 5. What is the animal ethics approval number? 6. Please state the number of mice in a cage. 7. Author should mention the expected and unexpected adverse events. 8. In section 2.9, the content is incoherent. Please rearrange. 9. How long is the treatment? Author should mention all the details in animal procedure so that reader can understand the flow clearly. 10. Please show the significant difference in Figures 1-13. 11. Author mentioned mean zone of inhibition of individual extract in section 3.1, but I could not find the value in Table 1. Please insert to the table. 12. Author repeated the method in result, section 2.4.1 and section 3.2. Please remove it in result section and interpret the result. 13. Please add the standard deviation and significant difference in Table 3. It is a must. 14. The toxicity study showed both ethanol extract of N. lotus root and water extract of A. sativum and ethanol extract of N. lotus root in combination at ratio (1:1) have same LD value, why author did not use ethanol extract of N. lotus root only? Please write the justification in the discussion. 15. Author mentioned significant difference in result, but there is no significant difference label in the figure. Please insert it. 16. The manuscript is too lengthy. Please reduce the page. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please double check the format, it is not consistent. 2. Please check the grammar, language. 3. The format of reference is not consistent. Please refer back the guideline. 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Dai Chuan Tan AMRSC
Department, University & Country	Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia