



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_32562
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIMICROBIAL POTENTIAL OF EXTRACTS OF Hyptis suaveolens (L) POIT. LEAVES ON SOME GRAM POSITIVE BACTERIAL ISOLATES
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	The work is interesting however the values of inhibition for the test bacteria obtained by the authors from the extract or its different fractions is greater than those suggested by JL Ríos, M.C. Recio / Journal of Ethnopharmacology (2005) 80-84 et al. In the paragraph of page 2 between lines 43 to 47 it is not clear if the author suggests that the drugs mentioned are also antimicrobial or if the antimicrobials as well as the drugs mentioned also derive from plants In the paragraph of page 3 between lines 48 to 51 the authors should justify with current bibliography In table 1 Change <i>Streptococcus pneumonia</i> to <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> The authors should explain why they show the sensitivity of <i>S. aureus</i> to antimicrobials but then do not determine the sensitivity to the extract or its fractions	The values of inhibition for any of the test microorganisms shown in this article represent a range of the concentration used against the test bacteria for both the antimicrobials and the extract and its fractions. The values recorded were the concentration where the highest inhibition was observed. Text have been removed Appropriate text and current bibliography has been inserted Changed The crude extract was not effective against <i>S. aureus</i> at all the concentration used (Tables 1, 2 & 3). These include some other results not presented in this article. The term 'not determined' used was as a result of the zero result.
Optional/General comments		