

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_87042
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial Activity of Essential Oil from Avocado (<i>Persea americana</i>) Seed and Pulp on Some Pathogenic Organisms
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.journalsajrm.com/index.php/SAJRM/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>In the abstract is mentioned that the phytochemical screening was done with standard methods. Further, in the section of methods, there is no reference to where the tests were based on, I think only one has reference.</p> <p>In the section 2.4 Antimicrobial screening: There is some inconsistency here when it comes to the microorganisms used. In the abstract is mentioned <i>Escherichia coli</i>, <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>, <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>, <i>Streptococcus pneumonia</i> and <i>Candida albicans</i>, but then in the methods “two were gram positive bacteria; <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>, <i>Bacillus subtilis</i> while other three were gram negative bacteria; <i>Escherichia coli</i>, <i>Salmonella sp.</i>”</p> <p>Still in the section 2.4, is mentioned that the cultures were diluted but the initial concentration or the used concentration is never mentioned.</p> <p>Section 2.5 “The broth culture of each organism was inoculated” – How this methodology is done, is not very clear.</p> <p>Section 2.6 – The whole paragraph is a little confusing.</p> <p>Results Table 3 – <i>C. albicans</i> is a yeast. So maybe a change On the title in table 3 will fix it or put these results in other part.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>I think this manuscript would benefit if in the first part of the discussion, when the differences in the phytochemistry is noted when compared with other works, the author elaborate a little more, and maybe try to give us a reason for those differences.</p> <p>Since the author choose microorganisms with such a clinical relevance, giving a little more emphasis to this could bring even more relevance to the results, for instance, <i>P. aeruginosa</i> is widely known for being a resistant bacterium.</p> <p>A last topic I think would bring value to this work is, if the author took advantage of the fact that there is gram positive and gram negative microorganisms and make a connection between this results and the results from the phytochemical analysis.</p> <p>References</p> <p>Some of the papers are not well referenced. I would recommend also the inclusion of some fresh literature; some articles seem a little outdated. In recent years, some interesting works with <i>Persea americana</i> came out, would be valuable to check on that and include that if the author think it fits the paper.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Paragraph 2 “<i>Persea americana</i> (...)” – Some parts seem a little repetitive and unnecessary, also some information would be a good fit for the first paragraph.</p> <p>In the section 2.4 Antimicrobial screening, the phrase “It was measured (...) was used” I don't think its necessary. Still in this section, needs to be a little clearer, for instance, disks with different concentrations of what? (a suggestion about the phrase structure was left in the document of the manuscript)</p> <p>Section 2.5 – Instead of “Susceptibility testing of organisms on the essential oil” I suggest</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>"Susceptibility testing of essential oils on organisms" (a suggestion about the phrase structure was left in the document of the manuscript)</p> <p>Results Some names aren't in italic. Table 1 – If possible, everything in the same units Table 2 – The nomenclature of the microorganisms change. Its more correct to use the same one in the entire paper. Table 4 – The formatting of the table is different</p>	
Optional/General comments	This work seems very promising. The author has a good base here to have a very interesting paper.	

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:	Andreia Sofia Roque Aires
Department, University & Country	Nova School of Science and Technology (FCT-NOVA), Portugal