

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_128144
Title of the Manuscript:	The cellular toxicity of Panax ginseng plant extract against certain pathogenic fungi and human lymphocytes
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Based on this manuscript, the scientific community can garner substantial proof that *Panax ginseng* extract is both antifungal and immunomodulatory. Moreover, this study fills gaps in the understanding of fungal pathogenesis by presenting its depressant impact on pathogenic fungi, including drug-resistant strains, and its influence on lymphocyte proliferation. The research also fosters the knowledge on bioactive plant extracts, which are eco-friendly solutions to synthetic antifungal agents. Furthermore, the results are useful for future drug design, as well as combined therapeutic approaches, helpful for both mycology and immunology fields.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	“Antifungal Activity and Immunomodulatory Effects of Panax Ginseng Extract on Pathogenic Fungi and Human Lymphocytes”	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract contains enough details but doesn't have to be all that wordy while the language used is suboptimal. An ideal manuscript abstract has to be accurate and concise with the ability to hint at the rationale, the approach, the important findings, and the recommendations conclusively. Below is a refined version of your abstract:</p> <p>This work focused on the mycological examination of clinical specimens and an anti-fungal and immunomodulatory role of Panax Ginseng alcoholic extract. Out of 110 samples, 67 tested positive for the fungus (61%) whereas 43 samples were negative for the fungus (39%). From among positive cases, 65.55% of the samples showed fungal growth while the remaining 34.45% of samples did not. Of all the species isolated 58.3% were Candida species, 25% Aspergillus and 12.5% Trichophyton. Adult females (55.6%) became infected more than adult male (44.4%) a large proportion of patient 30.6% had oral cavity as the most frequent site of infection. Highest infection rate was observed in 15–24 years and the lowest in individuals with >45 years of age.</p> <p>All isolated compounds exhibited a relatively potent antifungal activity against Candida, Aspergillus, Trichophyton, Microsporum, and Penicillium species and the pattern of the growth inhibition for Panax Ginseng extract was more pronounced at higher concentrations (140–200 mg/mL). The concentration required to inhibit the growth of the bacterial species was an 80–90 mg/mL range. It also produced immune responses by increasing the lymphocyte count by a positive dose dependent manner. P. Ginseng seems to prove its efficiency as an antifungal and immunomodulatory agent based on studies presented above. Additional investigations are still needed to establish its effectiveness in using this treatment in Mycosis.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Terminology Consistency: Changed the term "Alsabroed" into sabouraud medium (I guess that is what the author intended to write). If not, note the accurate name of the medium. Like this have to change all over the manuscript. 2. Clarity and Grammar: Avoided academic and professional jargon which complicates the language. 3. Structure: Clustered the procedure into subtopics for ease of following since the procedure can be rather complex. 4. Precision: More specifically, created the proper structure of the MIC and controls in order to have no confusion of its purpose. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As it can be seen from the manuscript text, references cover the range of years, however, the list of the particular bibliography sources is not given. • Also, Recent reference are not cited from 2020 to till date. 	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check the flow of the sentence to ensure it is correct and avoid trapped words if any. • Follow conventional scientific language, and terms should be used coherently and in the proper way. • It is being suggested that changes are made to the present text to ensure that the messages convey herein are grammatically correct and consistent where necessary. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>NIL</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	<u>C. Sangavi</u>
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	<u>M S Ramaiah University of Applied Sciences, India</u>