



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_49559
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Antibacterial Activity of Locally Prepared Herbal Cough Extracts against Klebsiella pneumoniae and Streptococcus pneumoniae</b>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>3.2-last line – Replace basing with Based 3.3: Line1 –Replace basing with Based.                      3.4: Line8- Plate reading was done and replace basing with based. 3.5: Line1- Replace inocula with inoculum. 3.6.1: Line16- &lt;8mm were considered as not-replace active with sensitive.                      4.1.1:Line 7- The concentration of active ingredients in the herbal extracts is very, since this will determine the therapeutic dosage of the herbal extracts.. This in turn will prevent any adverse effect of the herbal extracts on the patients.                      4.1.2: The standard drug concentration has already been determined in its preparation, hence its result is better than the herbal extracts.                      4.2: The MIC results are expected. Further research should be directed towards determining the MIC of the herbal extracts . This will not only determine their exact dosage, but also avert any inherent adverse effects of the herbal extracts on the patients..                      DISCUSSION: Line 1-K. <i>pneumonia</i> and <i>S. pneumonia</i> I still remain the leading causes of RTI worldwide. Since you did not determine the compounds in the herbal extracts, please delete Line17 from active to other.                      CONCLUSION                      Line 1-Generally all herbal extracts –add-used in this study had antibacterial activity. Delete from However to <i>S. pneumonia</i>.                      Delete from- Similarly to bacterial infections.                      Second to the last line under conclusion delete WORK.                      RECOMMENDATION                      2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph: Line 1-delete from since to used. Start with Future.                      Line 5- delete from on testing to extractsand add “ with a view to determining their dosage and possible side effects.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>This is a well articulated research work and should be accepted for publication. The authors should address the minor observations made</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Enurah Leonard Uwanibe</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Of Jos, Nigeria</b>