

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_124762
Title of the Manuscript:	Antifungal activity of Antsbush (<i>Struchium sparganophora</i>): a future remedy for candidiasis and cryptococcosis
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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)
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.	The manuscript highlights some of the critical gaps in the literature on the Antbush plant. There are not many antifungal studies done on plant extracts as most focus only on antibacterial study. I appreciate the clarity with which the authors present their data and the thoughtful analysis that accompanies their results.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is okay. Suggestion: Evaluation of the antifungal activity of <i>Struchium sparganophora</i> leaf extracts	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is excessive use of the word 'ZOI'. - All the ZOI recorded should not be included in the abstract. Please select the highest result and conclude. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I would suggest combining the limitations, recommendations and the conclusion to one section. All the other sections and the structure of the paper is sound.	
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.	The manuscript shows that the author has done his share of literature review, which helps highlight the limitations and the past findings. The research methodology and results section gives detailed outcomes of the research and also the statistical analysis provides the confirmation needed. Furthermore, the potential limitations and recommendations for future studies are addressed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	If available, I would suggest adding a few more references from the last 2-3 years. Otherwise, the references used are sufficient.	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I suggest having a third person review the manuscript for the English language accuracy and Grammer.	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I have added some comments in the manuscript. Please refer to it as well. - Throughout, the paper the words 'Antbush' and '<i>S. sparganophora</i>' are used interchangeably. Please use only one term throughout. - Try to minimize the use of first person thorough out the manuscript. - Please leave a gap between the numerals and the unit. Eg: 10 mm 	

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:	Udyanee Jayaweera
Department, University & Country	UCSI University, Malaysia