

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>There are some old references that should be replaced with new ones, if available. Insufficient as references were published in the past five years. This percentage has to increase to at least 40%. A lot of old references were used that have to be updated</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1 -General view: The manuscript was written in good English language and grammar.</p> <p>2- Introduction: Please summarize and phrase the introduction section into 3 paragraphs. The introduction must be divided into 3 paragraphs i.e., 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study and 3. Aim of the study.</p> <p>3- The authors didn't provide the exact study time and duration of research</p> <p>4. The pre-enrichment procedures were unclear concerning the culturing procedures.</p> <p>5- Results and Discussion: The results are to an extent clear in the tables but need photo for clear zone for MIC MBC in the text.</p> <p>6- The discussion is good readability, understanding, and good writing style,</p> <p>7- Conclusion: The authors did explain well.</p> <p>8- References: There are some old references that should be replaced with new ones, if available. Insufficient as references were published in the past five years. This percentage has to increase to at least 40%. A lot of old references were used that have to be updated.</p> <p>10-Tables: Well organized and well presented</p> <p>Some comments correct the manuscript is very good</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:	Sultan Farag Nagati
Department, University & Country	Animal Health Research Institute, Agriculture Research Center, Egypt