

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Food Research and Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFRN_101180
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIBACTERIAL EFFECT OF AWOLOWO WEED (<i>Chromolaena odorata</i>) EXTRACT ON <i>Salmonella typhii</i> ISOLATED FROM TYPHOID PATIENTS
Type of the Article	Original 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://journalajfrn.com/index.php/AJFRN/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>In the present study, the authors investigated the phytochemical constituents and antibacterial activity of <i>Chromolena Odorata</i> leaves against <i>Salmonella</i> species isolated from typhoid patients. 10 clinical samples were collected to isolate the microbe and different solvent extracts of <i>Chromolena Odorata</i> were used to identify antibacterial effect. The study is important, but the authors need to arrange results in a more systematic manner and discuss the results to justify the relevance of the study.</p> <p>YES</p> <p>The abstract need improvement in its writing style and the authors should be able to conclude more clearly.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Recent references are cited; but more references need to be referred to give a focussed discussion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Needs improvement	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the present study, the authors investigated the phytochemical constituents and antibacterial activity of <i>Chromolena Odorata</i> leaves against <i>Salmonella</i> species isolated from typhoid patients. 10 clinical samples were collected to isolate the microbe and different solvent extracts of <i>Chromolena Odorata</i> were used to identify antibacterial effect. The study need to be reported in a more structured and careful manner. The manuscript need few major corrections.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All tables and figures need to be cited in the text. The Figure numbers need to be given as per the order of reference in the result section. The quantitative data on phytochemical composition of different extracts of <i>C. pentandra</i> was already given in table 1; what is the point of table 7 and 8 and fig 3 ? It can be removed. The result section need to be rewritten more systematically. The titles of figures and tables should be self explanatory. For eg: titles like Table 3: Morphological Characteristics; Table 4: Biochemical Characteristics of what??? 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>5. Whether the authors got isolates A to F in all 1-0 samples? The result section couldnot give a clear idea on this.</p> <p>6. Authors need to confirm S.typhi by more reliable method like 16SrRNA sequencing.</p> <p>7. Authors need to mention ethical clearance statement in the methodology section for the use of clinical samples.</p> <p>8. The plates of bacterial inhibition zone can given given in the result section.</p> <p>9. The authors need to verify the results, add the p values</p> <p>10. The discussion and conclusion need to be more focussed.</p> <p>11. More recent references need to be referred to make better inference.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anju T R
Department, University & Country	Newman College, India