



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_48299
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE EFFECTS OF TWO MEDICINAL PLANTS AND COMMON DISINFECTANTS AGAINST AIR-BORNE FUNGI IN POULTRY HOUSE
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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>Be consistent with the significant figures.</p> <p>What are the sources of the disinfectants and the standard drugs used?</p> <p>What about the micrograph of <i>C. akabanensis</i>?</p> <p>Indicate what statistical approach was used in reporting the result: mean \pm sd or SEM?</p> <p>The author should also include what replicate the reported for the data below each table where necessary.</p> <p>There limited information on the AEO compared to AVA and that of EVA and EEO in the methods. What is the ration for reporting the way the concentrations were reported say 200(200), 200(400) 100(200) etc? And then make it lucid in the abstract section.</p> <p>In the discussion report of the variation and comparison for MIC and MFC were not seen.</p> <p>The references are not in line with the SDI authors' guideline. Revise.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Attend to the raised issues and fix the grammatical errors.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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:	<i>Uchendu, Mbah Okuwa</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Nigeria</i>