



**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 <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> 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>)

**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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Data of this paper is present but at very low levels. So, the paper can not be presented as a paper.</li> <li>2. Figures and figure legends are not clear.</li> <li>3. The methodology part is not good to publish and not sufficient to evaluate the level of biofilm expression in <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> strains exposed to Herbal Drugs. Herbal drugs and <i>K. pneumoniae</i> strains are not sufficient for a study, too.</li> <li>4. Study has not given interesting and insightful results. Increasing of biofilm formation in <i>K. pneumoniae</i> by herbal drugs used are not interesting and informative.</li> <li>5. How did the researchers prepare drug solutions before used in wells? There is no information about them in this study.</li> <li>6. There is <b>almostly</b> no discussion in the manuscript. Authors should compare their results with literature.</li> </ol>	There has been general review of this work which addressed some of your comments.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript language does not look like so bad at all, but it should be even better. The whole manuscript should be copyedited. English editing should be done especially for methodology part of manuscript. Experimental set up can be rewritten.</li> </ol>	The grammar of the work has been proof-read.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Methodology and results are so weak for publication.</li> <li>2. There is <b>almostly</b> no discussion in the manuscript. Authors should compare their results with literature and give some stronger information about their results.</li> <li>3. Based on its scientific merit, I can most kindly recommend your paper to be published in a forthcoming issues of the journal but it is not acceptable now.</li> </ol>	There has been general review of this work which addressed some of your comments. The sections reviewed are: Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Result, Discussion and Conclusion.