



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_38682
Title of the Manuscript:	EVIDENCE ON ANTIMICROBIAL EFFICACY OF COMMERCIAL TOOTHPASTE
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	Line 48: use "microbial culture instead of microbial isolates" Line 63: Negative control?	The word was changed to microbial cultures instead of microbial isolates in line 48. In line 63 the word negative was added.
Minor REVISION comments	Ethical clearance is required because commercial products were used.	In Malaysia, ethical clearance is just needed with the use of human or animal as experimental model. Ethical clearance is not needed for the use of commercial products.
Optional/General comments		