

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_104350
Title of the Manuscript:	Triple-action antifungal topicals, microbiologist's alarm
Type of the Article	Original

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>)

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)	Yes, because it describes the use of antifungals already available to the population Yes Yes, but it is necessary to adjust the keywords that are too broad Yes The manuscript is adequate Yes Modify the keywords for terms that are less comprehensive and that positively impact your article	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It just needs minor adjustments to some verbs, but nothing that makes it difficult to understand the text	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is interesting, it only needs minor adjustments as in the keywords, in addition it is necessary to adjust the conclusion so that it is more appropriate with the results and discussion carried out throughout the text	

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)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samir Mansour Moraes Casseb
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal do Pará, Brazil