

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_SAJRM_98760 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | ANTIMICROBIAL EFFICIENCY OF COMMONLY USED DISINFECTANTS AGAINST <i>Escherichia coli</i> and <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> . |
| 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.journalsajrm.com/index.php/SAJRM/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>1. The manuscript is tempted to evaluate the efficacy of some disinfectants against selected pathogens. The aim is important for health sector facilities to ensure using the appropriate disinfectant.</p> <p>2. It's not representing the results of the study which include disinfectant activity against some bacteria and fungi.</p> <p>3. The abstract contained different information than those presented in the methods section of the study, the author/s mentioned using agar well diffusion method to measure inhibition zones of disinfectants in the abstract, while, in the methods, impregnated discs were used.</p> <p>4. No, the abstract is not sub sectioned into background, aim, methods, results, and conclusion. No key words were provided. The introduction is not organized into background information, problem statement, proposed solution, literature reviews, and aim. Some sub sections are extra such as problem statement, aim, and literature reviews. Also, sub sections of literature reviews are not organized properly, whereas the author/s focused on ex; sub section: 'Application of phenolic compounds in disinfectants and antiseptic', its contents are not related to the title of the sub section; the order of sub sections are not following the proper sequent ex; 2.1 'phenol as disinfectant', then the author/s explained types of disinfectants and antiseptics, then returned to explain phenolic compounds as a new sub section, sub section titled 'Mechanism of Actions of Natural Antimicrobials' is not related to the aim of the study, sub section 'Method of evaluating effectiveness of phenolic compound' is not in proper order as its related to 2.1 sub section, all literature reviews' sub sections are not enumerated properly. Methods section is not replicable since it has missing information for bacteria and fungi isolation methods, no clinical samples types are mentioned, the culture methods are not specific to identify target bacteria, no information about fungi culture and isolation, no control samples were given for comparisons of the results, the original concentration of stock solution for each disinfectant is not mentioned, no statistical analysis is mentioned. The results are contained information which are not presented in the methods such as table 1, figures 1, and 2, table 2 contained <i>Klebsiella</i> sp that not mentioned in the methods section, figure 3 is missing information about each antiseptic concentration and types, table 3 is representing fungi isolates which were not mentioned in the methods section, same for table 4. In the discussion, the author/s explained disinfectants efficacy at a specific concentration (30%, 70%, 85%), such information is not presented in the methods and the results, discussion of disinfectant efficacy against fungi is missing.</p> <p>5. No, the study design is not proper, methods are not accurate for isolation of targets bacteria and fungi, no control or standard samples/ measurements were provided.</p> <p>6. No, all missing references are mentioned in the comments of the reviewed manuscript file. Also, references style is not meeting journal's requirements.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>1. The English language is not suitable for academic writing of research articles, many grammars issues, spelling, wrong word choices, unclear sentences, wrong tenses using, complex sentences were detected.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Non</p> | |

Comment [ZK1]: The title is not representing the contents

Comment [ZK2]: The subsection is placed in wrong order

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Name: | Zahraa Kamaz |
| Department, University & Country | Iraq |

