



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_28352
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial activity, safety and acceptability of formulated ginger-fortified hand sanitizer gel
Type of the Article	Original 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Line 123-128: How did the authors select the sample of 30 males and 30 females? Line 194-202: ... a total number of 20 carefully selected subjects recruited in this study. What are carefully selected subjects? The authors should state inclusive and exclusive criteria more elaborately. How did the authors recruit the subjects? Why did the authors recruit only two participants aged 40-59 years old? Line 204-206: Statistical analyses should be more elaborately. Independent and dependent variables should be described. The level of significance should be stated. RESULTS: line 216-217: was ANOVA used? If yes, the author should state it. Were all assumptions tested before using ANOVA? Did the author do post-hoc test after ANOVA? Why were not statistical tests used in table 2 and table 3? Ethical Issues: Was the study approved by an ethical committee? The author should state it in the manuscript.	• The simple random technique was used in the selection of the subjects. The method is stated in the article. • Line 194-202: ... a total number of 20 carefully... This has been addressed • Why did the authors recruit only two participants aged 40-59 years old? The subject were selected randomly and the inclusion and exclusion criteria has been stated. • The level of significance has been stated in the article. • ANOVA was used in the result represented in Table 2, however, there was no significant difference. ANOVA was not used for the data represented in Table 3 because the data represented were the percentage of growth inhibition. The ethical clearance was also sought from the Research Governing body of the Faculty of Science, Ekiti State University.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 29: "The levels of hand hygiene practice are still low" needs citation. Line 39-42: "Many plants have been reported to contain ... among others" is not clear. Line 61: "If encouraged it will in a great..." needs a verb.	• The statement has been deleted • The statement has been rephrased • If encouraged it will minimizing the use of chemicals.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 76: "The test organisms used to..." has grammar error. Line 158: the authors should state what the room's temperature and humidity are as they are different from various geographical areas.	• The test organisms used in this study include four fungi. • Values of temperature and humidity included.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript aims to evaluate the effectiveness of new herbal hand sanitizer. The structure is well-organised. The method is acceptable to address the aim. However, many issues need to be addressed.	