

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Biology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJOB_104350</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Triple-action antifungal topicals, microbiologist's alarm</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Manuscript</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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes, but abstract very long and manuscript Should contain an abstract of 150 words.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Tes</p> <p>No,</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. In results and discussion "antifungal Nystatin" written by NY. why Figure 1 "Nistatin" written by Ni.</p> <p>2. In result and discussion "The inventory of antifungals (figure 1) in the three cities allowed us to count 34 different brands of antifungals in our local pharmacies" The authors should be writing all 34 types. And why mention only eleven types of antifungals?</p> <p>3. In Methodology "we have in this questionnaire evaluated the qualification of the staff of the pharmacies." Where the qualification of the staff of the pharmacies?</p> <p>4. Why authors used Microsoft excel 2013 not high anther version like Microsoft excel 2021 or Microsoft 365?</p> <p>5. Reference schould be written as [1] not as (1)</p> <p>6. reference no.18 is the same reference no. 20</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kurls Ekram Anwer</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Shams University, Egypt</b>