SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



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 <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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

Introduction part need to be extended by inclusion of Problem statement Literature Review Hypothesis Proposed Solution Objectives There is not much background information about the studies done earlier in the plant materials. To be included in Introduction part with few references. There is no uniformity in references (For example, 2 and 10), there is no page numbers. Some references are in different format. It must be standardized according to the Journal format. In Table No 1, The superscripts *bcdefg* are need to be defined at the bottom of the Table. Not clear that which one is compared with which one, and the significance also. There are some Grammatical Errors in the Manuscript. Need to be checked throughout the Manuscript.		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)
Problem statement Literature Review Hypothesis Proposed Solution Objectives There is not much background information about the studies done earlier in the plant materials. To be included in Introduction part with few references. There is no uniformity in references (For example, 2 and 10), there is no page numbers. Some references are in different format. It must be standardized according to the Journal format. In Table No 1, The superscripts abodefg are need to be defined at the bottom of the Table. Not clear that which one is compared with which one, and the significance also. There are some Grammatical Errors in the Manuscript. Need to be checked throughout the Manuscript.	<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
Literature Review Hypothesis Proposed Solution Objectives There is not much background information about the studies done earlier in the plant materials. To be included in Introduction part with few references. There is no uniformity in references (For example, 2 and 10), there is no page numbers. Some references are in different format. It must be standardized according to the Journal format. In Table No 1, The superscripts *bcdefg* are need to be defined at the bottom of the Table. Not clear that which one is compared with which one, and the significance also. There are some Grammatical Errors in the Manuscript. Need to be checked throughout the Manuscript.		Introduction part need to be extended by inclusion of	
There is not much background information about the studies done earlier in the plant materials. To be included in Introduction part with few references. There is no uniformity in references (For example, 2 and 10), there is no page numbers. Some references are in different format. It must be standardized according to the Journal format. In Table No 1, The superscripts *abcdefg* are need to be defined at the bottom of the Table. Not clear that which one is compared with which one, and the significance also. There are some Grammatical Errors in the Manuscript. Need to be checked throughout the Manuscript.		Literature ReviewHypothesisProposed Solution	
the plant materials. To be included in Introduction part with few references. There is no uniformity in references (For example, 2 and 10), there is no page numbers. Some references are in different format. It must be standardized according to the Journal format. In Table No 1, The superscripts abcdefg are need to be defined at the bottom of the Table. Not clear that which one is compared with which one, and the significance also. There are some Grammatical Errors in the Manuscript. Need to be checked throughout the Manuscript.			
page numbers. Some references are in different format. It must be standardized according to the Journal format. In Table No 1, The superscripts abcdefg are need to be defined at the bottom of the Table. Not clear that which one is compared with which one, and the significance also. There are some Grammatical Errors in the Manuscript. Need to be checked throughout the Manuscript.			
of the Table. Not clear that which one is compared with which one, and the significance also. There are some Grammatical Errors in the Manuscript. Need to be checked throughout the Manuscript.		page numbers. Some references are in different format. It must be	
throughout the Manuscript.		of the Table. Not clear that which one is compared with which one, and the	
Minor REVISION comments			
	Minor REVISION comments		

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	

PART 2:

	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:	Mahendran Sekar	
Department, University & Country	Royal College of Medicine Perak, Universiti Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	

Approved by: CEO Created by: EA Checked by: ME Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)