

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	This is a very interesting study showing that the aqueous and alcoholic extraction of Warburgia ugandensis has antibacterial activity against typical uropathogens. The activity of the aqueous extract was higher than the alcoholic extract. This laboratory study is well performed and presented. To discuss the possible clinical efficacy for treatment of UTI, the authors should at least mention, that further studies concerning antibacterial activity in urine and urinary excretion are needed to develop these extracts further. A simple test could be to test the antibacterial activity of urine after ingestion of such alcoholic and aqueous extraction to demonstrate at least, whether the antibacterial substances are also excreted into the urine. Otherwise I have no further comments.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kurt G. Naber
Department, University & Country	Technical University of Munich, Germany