

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_100593
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of antimicrobial activities of medicinal plants used against microbial infections in Pregnant women in Delta State
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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript enough important for scientific community. This article explains about evaluation of antimicrobial activities of medicinal plants used against microbial infections in pregnant women in Delta State. The result showed that <i>Ficus exacerpata</i> and <i>Slenostemon monostachyus</i> had inhibitory effect on <i>Candida albicans</i>. <i>Peperomia pellucida</i> had no inhibitory effect on microorganisms though phytochemical compounds were present.</p> <p>Yes, appropriate enough</p> <p>Yes, appropriate enough, re-checking is required to be better</p> <p>Yes, appropriate enough, re-checking is required for table position, result and discussion, combined or not</p> <p>Yes, appropriate enough</p> <p>Yes, appropriate enough, if added it would be better</p> <p>Introduction and discussion need more deeply explanation to be better</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>re-checking is required to be better</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The number of sentences in 1 paragraph (minimum 3 sentences) was examined again, writing scientific names according to standard rules (italics), and also spaces please check again</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rahayu Fitriani Wangsa Putrie
Department, University & Country	Research Center for Applied Microbiology, Indonesia