



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_49349
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Screening and Antimicrobial Activity of Kenyan mushroom Ganoderma lucidum
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>1. The researchers seem to be working on a mushroom whose similar investigations have been done in India. While this is not completely inordinate with research, they did not add any other parameter of their own. What they have sort to do is to show how their findings differ from those of Indian which was not their research design or aim.</p> <p>2. The researchers did not show or report on the serial dilutions of the ten-fold process they mention. It would have been appropriate for them to describe how the ten-fold dilution of extract was done and what purpose it served. They reported only one result for both phytochemical appraisals and antimicrobial testing. It is standard practice to perform such experiments as triplicates and use standard deviations or standard error of the mean to report findings.</p> <p>3. Reporting other people's work, whole tables, as part on their own work without citations is gross plagiarism and unacceptable. Furthermore, they discussed the results!</p> <p>4. There is a mixed discussion of ideas and findings which are in conflict with findings. The researchers found out that the extracts and controls were ineffective to against three of the organisms E. coli, P. aeruginosa, K. pneumoniae and they attribute this to SYNERGISM. This shows lack on knowledge of the word or a copy and paste work.</p> <p>5. The researchers used positive controls of drugs that did not inhibit the microorganisms they chose themselves to us in experiments which in is unheard of in research. They needed to have used drugs and strains they were sure were sensitive to the drugs, otherwise there were no controls in the experiments but drugs that needed to be investigated as well.</p> <p>6. Pictures of the mushrooms when collected and fresh, pictures of the extraction process, pictures of the phytochemical screenings, media gels etc could have helped give some credence to the veracity of this work and show that some experiments were done.</p> <p>7. This work seem to be a copy and paste of Indian work in Kenya.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Greanious Alfred Mavondo
Department, University & Country	National University of Science and Technology, Zimbabwe