

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_95720
Title of the Manuscript:	Susceptibility of Candida albicans, Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli to extracts from different parts of mango (Magnifera indica) plant
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. The research topic is of great importance due to the continuous increase in the resistance of pathogenic microorganisms to antibiotics, for which the search for new microbial control agents is essential.</p> <p>2. It is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The summary is understandable.</p> <p>4. The structure of the work is correct.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The bibliographical references are adequate, but it would be interesting to consult a more up-to-date bibliography, from at least the last 5 years.</p> <p>7. Some suggestions were incorporated in the manuscript. The objective of the work and the summary section should be reviewed.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language used is appropriate and technically correct.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the materials and methods section, it would be convenient to indicate how the data were statistically analyzed, including the statistical program used. - In the manuscript I made some observations to improve the work. - Do not use as keywords those that are already present in the title. - 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	María Gabriela Di Barbaro
Department, University & Country	National University of Catamarca, Argentina