



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_43769
Title of the Manuscript:	Antifungal Potentials of Acacia nilotica, Ziziphus jujube Linn and Lawsonia Inermis
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>Language ++ Re-write the aims in one paragraph: concise and clear sentences. Material and Methods: 2-1) Protocol of the isolation of bacteria; give the reference 2-2) Preparation of Plant Material: The authors must give the quantity of the plant leaf samples used. 2-3) Antifungal Screening Using Agar Well Diffusion Method: There is some confusion with positive and negative control in the paragraph (52-53). Also author must check the effect of Methanol. - For statistical analysis, you have to cite the n (number of observations) for each mean in tables so the analysis can be reproduced. Results and discussion: The author doesn't explain how they chose the three plants used for antifungal activities. There is no information about the composition of each extract used in this study. This perhaps can explain the difference of antifungal activities observed with the tree extracts plants Also, he must discuss what is new in this study in comparison to the others study cited in literature. The author can see the effect of a mixture of different plant extract used</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The aim of study was clearly stated. See the manuscript, please. 2. The reference was provided. 3. The quantity of both the plant materials and solvent used was stated. 4. Corrected, Thank you 5. The "n" value was given 6. The information was and highlighted. 7. Corrected. 8. Comparison to the previous studies was made and highlighted as suggested. 9. The study is ongoing and hope to be published in near future
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	