

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_101575
Title of the Manuscript:	“Comparison of the antimicrobial efficacy of combinations of nutmeg, aloe vera and neem as an intracanal medicament with calcium hydroxide on enterococcus faecalis – an in vitro study.”
Type of the Article	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.journalprijournal.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> 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 it is important for scientific community</p> <p>“<i>In vitro</i> comparative study of the antimicrobial efficacy of combined nutmeg, aloe vera and neem as an intracanal medicament with calcium hydroxide on enterococcus faecalis”.</p> <p>Not comprehensive</p> <p>The subsections are not very appropriate, there are suggestions for corrections on grammar and coordination hence the highlighted on the manuscripts are suggested correct wordings while the underlined are to be removed and substituted with the highlighted words</p> <p>Again it was observed that the discussion section was filled with information that were to have been written in the introduction section hence this needs to be looked into for correction.</p> <p>The references are okay although not sufficient if brief activities of nutmeg, aloe vera and neem were given</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English quality is poor see lots of correction as pointed out in the manuscript	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The write up need to be re visited again and upgraded following the corrections	

### 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:	<b>John Ikechi Ordu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria</b>