



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_38681
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of traditional medicinal vegetables (ulam) against pathogenic microorganisms –A review
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. In the abstract section, the description of Ulam (page 1, line 6) requires grammatical restructuring, instead of "Ulam indicate some traditional Malaysian medicinal plants...", "Ulam is a group of traditional Malaysian medical plants..."</p> <p>2. An abstract is a summary of what is captured in the body of the review. The abstract of this article (page 1, line 6 – 13), did not give a summary of what is captured in the review work.</p> <p>3. Review of any topic requires consultation of various research works. The citations for each of the ulams in this article are not enough to validate their effectiveness as antimicrobial as your title suggest. The article was reporting only one research work in each of the ulams reviewed.</p> <p>4. There are several grammatical errors and poor use of speech. See page 4, line 88-89 (<i>Colocasia esculenta</i> was evaluated for preliminary of its antimicrobial activity...); page 6, line 113 – 114 (...aqueous extract of <i>P. minus</i> do not have any antimicrobial against tested 9 isolated pathogenic fish bacteria namely....)</p> <p>5. When several studies/researchers are referred to in a statement, more than one citation is required. See page 2, line 24-26; page 3, line 49-51; page 4, line 76-78.</p> <p>6. Use of "present study" usually refers to the study carried out by the author/writer. Therefore use of "present study" while referring to another author's work is wrong. See page 8, line 176; page 9, line 185.</p> <p>7. Page 6, line 117 – "Another study showed... Which study is being referred to? Cite the author accordingly</p>	Noted
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 1, line 18 (replace "modernizes" with 'modern'; replace "rich of "with rich in") Page 2, line 28 (delete " to be" on ...remains to be a serious issue...", put comma after "issue") Page 3, line 47 (replace "various part" with "various parts...") Page 3, line 49 (replace "had" with "have" in "Researchers had reported...") Page 3, line 57 (replace "application" with "applications") Page 3, line 61 (put comma after "Lecythidaceae family") Page 3, line 62 (replace "native to East Africa"... with "native of East Africa") Page 4, line 70 (replace "Boiling water extraction of..." with "Hot water extract of...", replace "...showing remarkable..." with "showed remarkable..." Page 4, line 76 (replace "...constituents within the..." with "constituents of the ...") <p>Etcetera</p>	Noted
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A subtitle is required after Introduction section, before discussing the various Ulams (page 2) 	