



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_SAJRM_49054 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Phytochemical Screening and Antimicrobial Analysis of Vernonia amygdalina and Psidium guajava Stems on Bacteria Associated with Dental Caries |
| 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>)



SDI 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (line 181 to 184) Small amount of plain agar was poured into the designated well to seal the bottom of the well. Zero point two milliliter (0.2 ml) of different concentration of the plant extract (500mg/ml, 375mg/ml, 250mg/ml and 125mg/ml) was poured into the designated wells. Which solvent was used for the reconstitution of the plant extract to obtain 500mg/ml, 375mg/ml, 250mg/ml and 125mg/ml (Line 202) Determination of Minimum Bactericidal Concentration (MBC) "The plates were then incubated at 37°C overnight." Please state the duration for incubation. How can the outcomes of this study be extrapolated for future research work? This aspect should be expanded in your discussion The discussion should be presented in a logical order | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The solvent used for reconstitution of the plant extract to obtain different concentration was stated. The duration of incubation was stated The discussion was reviewed. |
| Minor REVISION comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please include a representative image of the plants and the image of the result of antibacterial activity of the plant extract on the test organisms for reference purposes. By whom was the plant authenticated and identified? Was representative specimen deposited in a herbarium? This should have been carried out for verification purposes, and the specimen no. should be mentioned. | |
| Optional/General comments | Interesting manuscript but needs revision especially the discussion | |

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> | |