



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_42685
Title of the Manuscript:	Levels of Biofilm Expression in Klebsiella pneumoniae strains exposed to Herbal Drugs
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>)



**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Overall: Manuscript needs English revision and some phrases needs to address some interpretation error hence in line 3-4 " Drugs resistant strains of tuberculosis have been discovered with 4.5 million recent cases of resistance in tuberculosis globally in 2012" A disease is not resistant to drugs, it can be non responsive. The strains of <i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i> can be resistant.</p> <p>Materials and Methods Authors need to provide a reference for the biofilm methodology used, the method used is widely know such as available at <a href="https://www.biorxiv.org/content/biorxiv/early/2017/01/13/100214.full.pdf">https://www.biorxiv.org/content/biorxiv/early/2017/01/13/100214.full.pdf</a> and <a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3182663/">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3182663/</a>. The biofilm detection method used in this manuscript is a modification of those ones.</p> <p>Discussion Discussion needs to be re-written, lines 120-1136 are fit for the introduction section. This section should explain the meaning of the results. Authors fail to elucidate, exemplify the reasons why the results occur, propose mechanism or discuss the findings in general. Explanation of which content should be present at a manuscript section is available at <a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3626472/">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3626472/</a>.</p> <p>Conclusion Conclusion if not a conclusion per se, it is just a very brief resume of the main finding of the manuscript, please see <a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3626472/">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3626472/</a> for what should be the conclusion content.</p>	<p>Overall: There has been significant editing of the overall work.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: References for the methodology in biofilm detection has been provided.</p> <p>Discussion: It would be good to state the rational of the study first before interpreting the data hence this approach of the few introductory lines. However, the discussion has been edited.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> The conclusion has been re-written.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		