



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_49067
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical analysis and In-vitro screening of antimicrobial activities of <i>Ocimum gratissimum</i> on microorganisms isolated from wound infections
Type of the 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	<p>The introduction for the different bacterial strains and candida is too verbose, especially from lines 85-115. I recommend some abbreviation of this part. This is an original research paper, not a lecture class for novel students to mention eminent old bacteriologist, such as Escherich or Klebs.</p> <p>Candida is a fungi, and this should be highlighted at the introduction and further discussed. The effects leaf extracts on bacterial or eukaryotic cells is clearly different.</p> <p>Edit the text and the punctuation. The English should be edited, and the grammatical errors corrected. Strains should be written in italics, as <i>Candida albicans</i>.</p> <p>Line 140, Methods: The phytochemical analysis of alcoholic extracts of <i>Ocimum gratissimum</i> should be described with more detail. Table I is very qualitative. This is not enough. The approximate content of the different types of biomolecules at Table 1 would be included. The differences between methanol and ethanol should be discussed (mostly alkaloids).</p> <p>Concentrations should be consistent throughout the manuscript: Line 169: concentrations: 250, 125, 62.5, 31.25, 15.625, 7.8125, 3.91, 1.95, 0.98 mg/mL Line 192: 200mg/ml, 100mg/ml, 25mg/ml and 6.25mg/ml Tables 2 and 3: 200, 100, 50, 25, 12.5, 6.25 mg/ml. Really confusing. Clear up!.</p> <p>Table 4: 3125 is too high. Huge amount. Data with Methanol seems to be wrong. They are unbelievable according previous Tables. Methanol extract should be eliminated at this Table. In fact, methanol extract is rather useless.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Lines 12-15 abstract: The concentration of the extracts for these effects should be indicated.</p> <p>Line 21 abstract: Secondary metabolites of this plant extracts could enhance rapid healing of wound infections.</p> <p>Line 54: Delete the unnecessary sentence It is of the family Lamiaceae, genus Ocimum and species gratissimum [42].</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The format of the tables and the style of the references is a chaos!!.. The contribution is not very relevant, the extracts are unfortunately not very active (although it is not surprising that they are less strong than antibiotics) but anyway, the manuscript should be written in a clear, ordered and understandable style. The current preparation is careless</p> <p>Discussion is poor and unfocused. Comparison of data with those reported at ref. 13 should be further discussed. The role of alkaloids and glycosides would also be discussed.</p> <p>Conclusion should be rewritten. The first sentence means that <i>K. pneumoniae</i> is more susceptible than other strains to ethanolic extract of <i>Ocimum gratissimum</i>, but not the opposite. The effect of the extract is not observed at any concentration, as it is claimed.</p>	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	F. Solano
Department, University & Country	School of Medicine, University of Murcia, Spain