

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Microbiology Research Journal International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_MRJI_119231</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>An assessment of the epidemiology and in vitro susceptibility of Giardia lamblia trophozoites and cysts to a variety of plant extracts</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalmri.com/index.php/MRJI/editorial-policy> )

## 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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As per my Observation: Respective Manuscript can help many researchers in understanding Evaluation of antimicrobial activity of herbal plants</li> <li>2. Title is suitable as per manuscript</li> <li>3. Abstract is comprehensive.</li> <li>4. Structure including section and subsection of manuscript are suitable</li> <li>5. Manuscript is scientifically correct.</li> <li>6. No. of reference are sufficient however try to add or replace reference with more recent references.</li> </ol> <p>Beside these all-comments few observations are related to grammar and spelling of Manuscript. Ensure correct spelling and grammar of article using appropriate software.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>Please check English using proper software to ensure quality of English and grammar of manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Pls check the representation of result table and make it uniform and little more attractive</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>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sunny Dhiman
Department, University & Country	Chandigarh College of Pharmacy, India