

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_88150
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial activity and in silico ADME prediction of synthesised 8-hydroxyquinoline azo compounds against some ESKAPE human pathogens and Mycobacterium smegmatis.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract The abstract requires corrections. The background of the topic is confusing and there are no clear objectives. The results seem confusing. Rewrite the abstract with a sequential structure (Introduction, objectives, methods, main results, and conclusion). Material and methods Why did the paper not use high efficiency chromatography for analysis? In 2.5.1 (Antimicrobial Activity) the method mentions that it used "agar", but in fact it should be "broth". What was the culture broth used? Why did you use this method to evaluate the minimum inhibitory concentration? In general, microbiological analyses are confusing. Rewrite to standardize the methodology used to test antibiotics and synthesized compounds against bacteria. Has a test been performed to check the susceptibility profile of bacteria that are not ATCC? In 2.5.4, on the evaluation of biofilm production, the methodology needs to validate and confirm that the microorganisms produce biofilm, because ATCC microorganisms were not used and not all produce biofilm.	
Minor REVISION comments	None.	
Optional/General comments	None.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Agenor Gomes dos Santos-Neto
Department, University & Country	Tiradentes University, Brazil