

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_123315
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical analysis and effect of Myristica fragrans extract on Escherichia coli and Staphylococcus aureus strains isolated from Automated Teller Machine, Bikaner, Rajasthan
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it explores the phytochemical properties of <i>Myristica fragrans</i> (nutmeg) and its potential antibacterial effects against <i>Escherichia coli</i> and <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>, two common and clinically relevant pathogens. By focusing on bacteria isolated from Automated Teller Machines (ATMs), the study highlights a unique and often overlooked source of microbial contamination, emphasizing the importance of public hygiene. The research could lead to the development of natural antibacterial agents, which are increasingly needed due to the rise of antibiotic resistance.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<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 should be thoroughly revised to make it more comprehensive.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>In the introduction, the author should provide link between lifestyle diseases and microbial infections and justify the importance of the reported work for the management of both diseases.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The use of well-established methods for extracting and analyzing the phytochemicals from <i>Myristica fragrans</i> ensures the reliability of the results. Additionally, the study's focus on isolating specific bacterial strains from a real-world environment, such as ATMs, adds practical relevance to the findings. The use of standard microbiological techniques to assess the antibacterial efficacy against <i>Escherichia coli</i> and <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> further strengthens the scientific validity of the research.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>Ensure proper citation of relevant research studies and literature that support the study's context and findings?</p> <p>The authors need to be consistent in the references style and provide more recent and updated references to support their statements. (Remove old reference example 1993)</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript needs to be revised by a native English speaker.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The results of the antibacterial activity need to be well presented. The author should use comparative statements such as weak, moderate, and significant to qualify the activity.</p> <p>Is there any reason for the choice of the two bacterial strains?</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Ahmed Raza Sidhu
Department, University & Country	University of Sindh Jamshoro, Pakistan