

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_128486
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the antibacterial potential of commercial herbal mixtures against clinical isolate of Salmonella typhi: an in-vitro experimental analysis.
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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the potential of commercial herbal mixtures as alternative treatments against antibiotic-resistant <i>Salmonella typhi</i> , addressing a critical gap in current therapeutic approaches. It highlights the phytochemical properties of locally available herbal mixtures, offering evidence for their antimicrobial efficacy in vitro. The findings contribute to ethnopharmacology and could inform the development of new antimicrobial agents, particularly for resource-limited settings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is generally clear and informative. However, it could be made more concise and reflective of the primary findings.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from more precise wording. The mention of methodology (e.g., agar well diffusion) and key results (e.g., IBA-ENTR5 exhibiting the highest activity) is helpful. Suggestions: 1. Clarify that only one strain of <i>S. typhi</i> was tested to manage expectations. 2. Emphasize the significance of findings in relation to antibiotic resistance. 3. Remove redundant phrases to enhance readability.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with appropriate experimental designs, such as phytochemical screening and determination of antimicrobial activity through MIC and agar well diffusion methods. However, addressing limitations like the lack of diverse strains of <i>S. typhi</i> or more advanced phytochemical analyses would strengthen the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are generally recent and sufficient, covering relevant studies in phytochemistry and antimicrobial resistance.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, some sentences could be restructured for brevity and coherence, particularly in the introduction and discussion sections. Minor grammatical errors and redundancies should be reviewed to ensure seamless readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript explores an important topic, providing valuable data on the antibacterial efficacy of herbal mixtures against <i>Salmonella typhi</i> . This aligns with the journal's focus on innovative approaches to combat antimicrobial resistance. While the study is methodologically sound, there are areas where the manuscript can be enhanced: Title: While informative, it could be refined for conciseness and focus on key findings. Consider a more streamlined title as suggested. Language: Minor grammatical issues and redundancies throughout the manuscript should be reviewed for better readability. With these minor revisions, the manuscript has strong potential for publication and significant contributions to the field.	

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:	Kazi Abdus Sobur
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh Agricultural university, Bangladesh