

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_109117
Title of the Manuscript:	USE OF COMMON HERBS TO CONTROL MICROBIAL AEROSOLS IN TOILET ROOMS.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is important in the scientific community but requires significant improvement in the content.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It was difficult to review due to the lack of line numbers, making it hard to point out errors. 2) Starting with the abstract, the abstract is unnecessarily long. The authors should briefly describe the aim, method, result, and benefit of the investigation. 3) The literature review section needs to be rewritten as some parts were copied verbatim from published articles. 4) The authors did not provide a rationale for the study. They should explain the relevance of the investigation. 5) It was unclear if the authors measured the microbial load in the toilets before exposing them to disinfecting herbs. The authors should consider including this information in their method. 6) There is no description or reference to the methods used for the identification of microbial agents. The authors should provide a brief description of these methods to ensure reproducibility. 7) The study found that using a combination of garlic, scent leaf, and ginger is effective in reducing microbes. However, the authors did not explain how they arrived at this conclusion. To improve the study, the authors should consider measuring the microbial load at different time intervals before and after introducing the herbs at different stages. This will help to better understand the effectiveness and mechanism of action of the herbal combination. 8) The authors did not mention whether they used any quality control measures in the experiment, they should consider infusing this section. 9) The manuscript needs more references. The authors have made several statements that should have been supported by references. Additionally, some references mentioned in the text are not included in the reference list, and vice versa. The authors should consider removing outdated references that are at least seven years old. 10) The manuscript contains an excessive amount of repetitive descriptions of herbs, the authors should consider reducing it. 11) The authors should use alternative visualisations instead of relying heavily on tables to present their results. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The authors should consider checking their spellings, for example, mould not mold. Sabouraud not sadourand.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript requires improvement to effectively convey the intriguing concept of using natural, unharmed herbs to reduce/eliminate microbial aerosols.</p>	

[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:	Martina Chukwu
Department, University & Country	Institute of Cancer and Genomic Research, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom