

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Microbiology Research Journal International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_123875
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>IN VITRO ANTIFUNGAL ACTIVITY OF SOME ETHANOL PLANT EXTRACTS AGAINST CANDIDA SPECIES ISOLATED FROM HIGH VAGINAL SWABS OF WOMEN ATTENDING A HOSPITAL IN ENUGU STATE, NIGERIA.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	The article highlights the importance of finding new compounds for the treatment of vaginal infections caused by <i>Candida</i> spp. This is a topic of utmost importance due to the limited availability of antifungals and drug resistance, which is increasingly common and makes treatment difficult. Compounds from medicinal plants have a greater appeal, since they may already be present in people's daily lives. However, it should be better written and some care should be taken, especially in formatting and writing.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is appropriate but does not arouse the reader's curiosity. Try to highlight that extracts of typical plants from Nigeria were used in the manuscript.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract does not mention which conventional antifungals were used as controls to evaluate the antifungal activities of the medicinal plant extracts and what the MICs of these antifungals were, thus making the comparison flawed.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	In general, the sessions are coherent, however a session on the statistical analysis used in the manuscript is missing.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript has a good theme, however, it lacks some criteria that are important for publication, which I will highlight below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The writing of scientific names according to the standards should be reviewed.</li> <li>- The inclusion of standard strains or ATCCs for evaluation of the compounds, since the number of clinical isolates is not sufficient to demonstrate that the compounds have significant activity.</li> <li>- The inclusion of better defined controls for each test to assess susceptibility to conventional antifungals.</li> <li>- Pay attention to the formatting standards for writing the manuscript.</li> <li>- In the methods, the McFarland scale was used to standardize the test inoculum, however it is not the best way for this standardization since the filaments produced by some <i>Candida</i> species can interfere with the turbidity of the inoculum, and do not properly represent a colony-forming unit.</li> </ul>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	References must be more recent; the vast majority of cited references are more than 10 years old.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The manuscript must undergo a thorough review of the quality of the English. I suggest a review by a native speaker.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript must undergo a major revision in order to become scientifically robust and technically sound.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Isabele Carrilho Jarros</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Estadual de Maringa, Brasil</b>