

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Journal of Advances in Microbiology</b>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JAMB_92240</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>In-vitro Antibacterial Activity of Allium sativum on Common Food Poisoning Bacteria</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>   |

### 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:

<https://www.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | 1)The title page should contain a brief title, name(s) of author(s) and their affiliations.The name of the corresponding author should be indicated along with telephone and fax numbers (with country and area code) along with full postal address and e-mail address.<br>2) References should follow the style as per manuscript guidelines.<br>3)Zone of inhibition pics are to be given.<br>4) A brief acknowledgment section is needed.<br>5) Check author guidelines for declaration of AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS, CONSENT,ETHICAL APPROVAL.<br>6) Zones of inhibition were calculated along with well diameter or without well diameter?<br>7) Mode of action of active compounds should be predicted from previous papers.<br>8) Positive and negative controls which were in tabular form should be analysed with reasons that might increase or decrease in values.<br>9) How standard is reflecting on evaluation of data should be properly discussed.<br>10) Along with high yielding best results, low yielding results should be discussed and reason for high and low yields should be analysed and discussed. |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | 1) Scientific names should be in italics.<br>2) There should be spacing in text after full stop.<br>3) word et al. should be in italics.<br>4) Paragraph spacing should be properly adjusted.<br>5)ml should be indicated in small letters.<br>6) short forms should not be used in written part.<br>7)Discussion part labelled as 1.   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | 1) Highlighted yellow-already corrected.<br>2) Highlighted green-need to be corrected.  |   |

### 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Surya Satya Sravanthi Pammi</b>           |
| Department, University & Country | <b>SVRK Government Degree College, India</b> |