

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_98032
Title of the Manuscript:	Design, Synthesis and Antibacterial activity of some 3-methyl-2-oxo-1,2-dihydroquinoxaline-6-sulfonohydrazone derivatives.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Most of the references used are out dated. Kindly refer to the latest 5 years article for 70 to 80% of the articles referred to.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article is interesting and well written. Good job. However the content and the lab investigations can be improved by adding the negative and positive control. The negative control could be an antibiotic that has similar actions and when compared with these drugs will simply give a either a significant finding or an insignificant finding amongst the compounds tested and further confirm and justify the results. The statistical methods to compare these drugs and compounds were not elaborated in the methods section.</p> <p>The keywords in the abstract section should be limited to 5 or 6 keywords. Please refer tom the guidelines to author. Most of the references used are out dated. Kindly refer to the latest 5 years article for 70 to 80% of the articles referred to.</p> <p>The discussion section can improved by discussing the journals which contradict or confirm the findings. Find articles that justify and agreeable to the result findings to further endorse and support</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	the results. Thus, making the discussion more debatable and interesting and hopefully can widen and expand then ideas. Otherwise, good effort. Can be further improved. Good luck and all the best!	
--	--	--

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:	Azmah Saat
Department, University & Country	Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia