



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have examined their response and manuscript. They have simply made few changes and none of my suggestions were considered. Please consider these comments- 2. First of all, it doesn't look like a review manuscript; instead look like published abstracts in a proceeding. 3. Introduction should have little explanation on ulam, like vegetables used and mention objectives of this review. 4. There is no mention of material & methods, please refer (Bachok et al., 2014, Asia Pac J Clin Nutr 2014;23(3):369-376) 5. Author has to gather all the ingredients vegetables used for preparing ulam and come up with a table. 6. Tables are to be made to put information at one place regarding studies carried to till date and their outcomes. 7. Discussion is missing!! 	The objectives of this review were mentioned in introduction section as suggested by reviewer and was highlighted in yellow. This is a review paper, so we think it don't need a materials and method section as a research paper. Discussion part was included in separate ulam section as it might be confusing to discuss at different discussion section.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of terms like; "This study", "This finding" "present study"...try to avoid such terms...use past tense instead 	The used of all this term was checked and changed accordingly.
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The review manuscript entitled "Effectiveness of traditional medicinal vegetables (ulam) against pathogenic microorganisms" is a good attempt in concentrating scattered knowledge, and also it is written well. However, there are several shortcomings in the manuscript and are to be addressed. Review should have four parts like, 2. 1. Title and abstract, 2. Introduction, 3. Body structure, 4, Discussion, conclusion & future aspects. 3. Please refer following article you would get overall idea about review.. (Bachok et al., 2014, Asia Pac J Clin Nutr 2014;23(3):369-376) 	Discussion part was included in separate ulam section as it might be confusing to discuss at different discussion section.