

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_98790
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial Activity of Herbal Plants used for Treatment of Gastroenteritis Infection in Tharaka Nithi County, Kenya
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:

(<https://www.journalsajrm.com/index.php/SAJRM/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)
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. Yes, the article deals with a theme that has a lot of theory and practice, additionally it brings a discussion about the use of popular medicines and their importance for science and discoveries of new products. 2. You agree. 3. Yes, it covers what is necessary. 4. Yes. 5. Yes, correctly. 6. References are also in accordance with the theme worked and taking into account recent works.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, English is in line with the work academically.	
Optional/General comments	The work is excellent and brings new discussions to a broad topic, but still considered scarce in research.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mikaela Clotilde da Silva
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Campina Grande, Brazil