



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_47185
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the antimicrobial potentials and adverse effect of kolanut (Kola nitida Malvaceae) on the oral cavity and the impact on cariogenic bacteria.
Type of the Article	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	In vitro antimicrobial activity should be properly presented and not only using MIC, why not measure zone of inhibition (mm) using Agar well diffusion test?	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Line 3: Title should capture Socio-demographic study Line 13: oral microflora Line 15: microbiological is a single word Line 19: which community, please specify Line 20: Define DMFT before abbreviation Line 21-23: 'and the poor oral health seeking behaviours of participants were observed as factors contributing to a poor oral hygiene status and consequently the impairment of oral health of the kola nut consumers' should be a concluding part of the abstract, not in results. Line 26-27: (a) include the values of antimicrobial activity of kolanut against <i>Streptococcus spp</i> and <i>Actinomycetes</i> and <i>Lactobacillus spp</i> in parenthesis. (b) Compare kolanut with the commercial antibiotics used as positive control, which has better activity? Capture this in the abstract Line 45-46: capture some local and native names of Kola nut in West Africa Line 55-56: 'against <i>Streptococcus spp</i> and an average activity against <i>Actinomycetes</i> and isolate of <i>Lactobacillus spp</i> ' statement is incomplete Line 60: replace 'indicated' with 'shown' Line 126: remove the question mark in 100 µm/l? volume of MH Broth Line 136: replace 'we have' with 'there was' Line 214-218: express values singly, not 01, 02, 05 or 07. Use 1, 2, 3, and 7. Represent the values in a Table. Line 227: Result of Antimicrobial activity of kolanut against the isolates is not well presented, what are the values of the zones of inhibition (mm) if done? Why is the invitro study limited only to MIC? Table 7, check the spelling of <i>Actinomycetes</i> and use lower case for species Line 302: Remove 'Phytochemical evaluation in the current study' Line 313-315: what did you observe on <i>Actinomycetes</i> ?	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Findings from this study should capture and reflect more of microbiological analyses, compared to that of Socio demographic	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Oladejo, Babayemi O.</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Federal University of Technology, Nigeria</b>