

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_95766
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial activity of Warburgia ugandensis on selected standard organisms that cause urinary tract infections
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>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. It details preliminary information on the potential of <i>Warburgia ugandensis</i> on management of UTIs. The preliminary information may be used for further studies.</p> <p>2. The title has no problem, however, author needs to include name of the "authority" or "author", the individual who first named the plant "scientifically".</p> <p>3. Abstract is unnecessarily long. It has left some important aspects and has several issues as highlighted in manuscript. It has more words than allowed by Journal.</p> <p>4. Somehow Yes. However, there is a need for restructuring as authors keep on repeating information everywhere and also, authors mix sections eg some results are in methodology, and discussion section instead of results section. Some information in methodology should be in introduction etc as seen in highlighted manuscript.</p> <p>5. Not entirely. Some comments in the manuscript are not scientifically correct and are misleading eg when authors' state that, the <i>Warburgia ugandensis</i> may be adopted for treatment of urinary tract infections while the actual activity of the extract is too low for a crude extract.</p> <p>6. NO!! References are wrongly cited, references are missing in most sentences especially in introduction and discussion part. Most references are not recent and references have not followed the writing style of the journal.</p> <p>Methodology is inadequate. Authors have not provided methodology for phytochemical screening..</p> <p>Discussion is not deep enough. Authors have not given scientific explanations on their findings with respect to ethanolic vs aqueous extracts</p> <p>Results are not sufficient. Authors could not provide standard deviations Nor any statistical tests of their data, while the experiment is said to have been done in triplicates. What about activity indices?</p> <p>Symbols are incorrectly written, Scientific names did not follow the rules for scientific writing</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Language is suitable, but some improvements are needed as highlighted in manuscript	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Cyprian Beda Mpinda
Department, University & Country	University of Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania