

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_105261
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF PATHOLOGICAL CHANGES IN VITAL ORGANS AFTER SEVEN DAYS ADMINISTRATION OF OYSTER MUSHROOMS AGAINST PATHOGENIC STAPH INFECTION
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>)

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 The topic of this paper is relevant, timely, and of interest to the audience of this journal.</p> <p>No, The title is not clear, It should be simple and specific, and it should be as short as possible, expressing the content, so that the reader can get a good idea of the content of the research and its content from the title.</p> <p>No, the researcher should summarize the most important aspects and the most important points related to the research.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>It would have been better for the trial period to be a month or more so that the results would be more accurate.</p> <p>The references were not properly recent, if preferably better if 80% of references were within the last five years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality of the article are poor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The researcher must interpret the results he obtained, and compare them with the objectives set for the research, which were presented in the introduction to the research in a detailed manner.</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:	Ayyad W. Al-Shahwany
Department, University & Country	College of Science, University of Baghdad, Iraq