



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_29460
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical screening and antimicrobial activity of three medicinal plants against urinary tract infection pathogens
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Introduction line no. 30 first line common infections Line 33 includes . it would be better if author describes procedure phytochemical extraction by water aswell. results section has to be rewritten . (line 150 describes that compounds were not detected in selected plants line 154,155 are bit confusing kindly rewrite. Line 160 it has to be none of the phytochemical was.	Line no 30 and 33 corrected. Phytochemical extraction using water (aqueous) is now included in the paper (line 112-120). Line 150-152 describes the components that were detected and those not detected. Lines 154 and 155 have been restructured. About line 160, the extracts were used to carry out the sensitivity and not the individual phytochemicals.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Manuscript is good and I appreciate the efforts of author in doing this research. I think grammatical mistakes have to be rectified and if would be better it is been scrutinised by person having good efficiency in English.	I have gone through the manuscript again with emphasis on the correction pointed out. I do hope it is better now.