

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRIMPS_108602</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Reduction of Salmonella enterica &amp; Staphylococcus aureus biofilm development on glass tube by plant extracts</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Yes.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Yes.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The motility result was missing from the summary.</b></li> <li>4. <b>They need adjustments.</b></li> <li>5. <b>No.</b></li> <li>6. <b>No.</b></li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Summary</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o There was no information about the motility result in the summary.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Introduction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Structurally, the introduction needs readjustment as it has huge paragraphs, making reading tiring.</li> <li>o Names of some species are not in italics.</li> <li>o Paragraphs without continuity in reading;</li> <li>o I suggest making the introduction more concise.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Methodology</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Specify the origin of the bacterial lines used in the study, whether they were derived from a collection of microorganisms or of clinical origin, for example;</li> <li>o Item 2.3: Table 1 is not a table but a table. Adjust formatting. Furthermore, it is important to inform the reference used for the information on popular uses indicated in table 1.</li> <li>o It is necessary to indicate the botanist responsible for identifying the plant species, as well as the exsicata number and its place of deposit.</li> <li>o Inform the concentrations of the extracts used in the tests;</li> <li>Item 2.5 reports two divergent wavelengths, 540 nm and the formula uses 570 nm. Which of the two is correct?;</li> <li>o Item 2.6: correct volume and temperature;</li> <li>Item 2.7 reports two divergent wavelengths, 540 nm and the formula uses 570 nm. Which of the two is correct?;</li> <li>o Add a topic of the statistical analysis used in the study.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Results</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Figure 2: inform which parameter is used on the y axis of the graph that indicates biofilm reduction;</li> <li>o I suggest that the authors determine the Minimum Inhibitory Concentration of the extracts and not just check how much a given concentration reduces the number of bacteria;</li> <li>o Several times species names are not italicized.</li> <li>o Since the authors do not report a standard deviation or number of repetitions of the experiment, it is observed that the tests were carried out only once. Therefore, the reported results do not provide assurance of reproducibility and possible errors in execution.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Discussion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Authors report that the reduction of biofilm was dose dependent but this information is not correct as tests at different concentrations, correlating the dose-dependence, are not demonstrated.</li> <li>o Reformulate the discussion, adding more references that enrich the discussion of the results obtained with the information already available in the literature.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Conclusion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Rephrase the conclusion, informing the conclusion of the results in a specific and objective way.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sávio Benvindo Ferreira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Campina Grande, Brazil</b>