

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_99389 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Phytochemical, Antioxidant and Antimicrobial Potentials of Azadirachta indica Leaf Extract using Bacteria Isolated from Polluted Water as Test Organisms |
| 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Certainly, the manuscript is significant to the scientific community as it explores the potential antioxidant and antimicrobial properties of Azadirachta indica leaf extract. The study utilized bacteria that were isolated from polluted water as test organisms, providing valuable insights into the potential applications of this extract in mitigating the harmful effects of environmental pollution. Overall, the findings of this study have important implications for the development of new approaches to combatting bacterial infections and environmental pollution, making it a valuable contribution to the field of biotechnology and beyond. 2. Yes. It's suitable. 3. Indeed, the abstract of the manuscript is highly comprehensive and provides a concise summary of the key findings and implications of the study. 4. The manuscript's structure and subsections are appropriately organized, making it easy for readers to follow the study's logic and conclusions. 5. The manuscript is scientifically accurate, as it uses rigorous and well-validated experimental methods to investigate the potential antioxidant and antimicrobial properties of Azadirachta indica leaf extract against bacteria isolated from polluted water. The results are carefully analyzed and interpreted, ensuring that the study's conclusions are based on sound scientific principles. 6. Some more recent references could further enhance the manuscript's relevance and validity, and it is essential to adhere to standard citation formats to ensure proper credit and acknowledgement of sources. | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>The English language quality of the article appears to be appropriate for scholarly communication, with clear and concise writing that effectively conveys the study's objectives, methods, and findings to a scientific audience.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript appears to have omitted information on the percentage yield of the Azadirachta indica leaf extract, which could be an essential factor in evaluating the efficiency of the extraction process. Including this information would enhance the manuscript's completeness and aid in the reproducibility of the study. 2. The introduction section of the manuscript seems to be relatively brief, offering limited context and background information on the study's topic. Expanding this section could improve the manuscript's clarity and better situate the research within the broader scientific discourse. 3. The manuscript may have described the phytochemical screening as qualitative in the methods section, despite being conducted quantitatively. This could have been an oversight or a formatting issue, but it is important to ensure that the description accurately reflects the methodology used to avoid any confusion or misinterpretation by readers. <p>It is essential to carefully check and avoid any typographical errors in the manuscript, as these can detract from the professionalism and credibility of the study, and potentially mislead readers.</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> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | M. Vijayabaskaran |
| Department, University & Country | JKKN College of Pharmacy, The Tamil Nadu Dr. M. G. R Medical University, India |