

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_99768
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE PHARMACOLOGICAL REPOSITIONING OF THIOCOLCHICOSIDE AS AN ANTIBACTERIAL DRUG
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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>It has substantial importance to the scientific community, especially due to wide spread of antimicrobial resistance.</p> <p>It is okay, but the objectives and conclusions should match with the title and findings.</p> <p>The title does not exactly reflect what the authors aimed at! The conclusions in the abstract and the main text are very distinct. The abstract is so ambiguous! The subsections in the METHODOLOGY should be rephrased, and I suggest to use Materials and methods. For example : what is the difference between Characterization of Antibacterial Activity and determination of Minimum Inhibitory Concentration? There are so many errors that should be corrected before being published. They are OK</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The words "sowing" should be replaced by inoculation Could the word "halo" be explained? In results section: these issue should be clarified: [ #U: Indeterminate for thiocholchicoside concentrations used in the assay; (-): CBM: Minimum Bactericidal Concentration]. Can the authors provide a reference for this statement "The Minimum Bactericidal Concentration (MBC) will be considered the lowest concentration that prevents the visible growth of bacteria or allows the formation of up to three Colony Forming Units (CFU). The experiments will be performed in triplicate." In abstract should clarify this statement: In the antibacterial activity characterization test, thiocholchicoside showed bacteriostatic action. Thus, although this drug is already safe for human use, no significant antimicrobial effects were observed in standard bacterial strains! T</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The decision to publish is in the discretion of the editor. But the manuscript needs major revisions.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kennedy Daniel Mwambete</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania</b>