



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_36205
Title of the Manuscript:	IN VITRO COMPARISON OF METRONIDAZOLE AND TINIDAZOLE ACTIVITY AGAINST TRICHOMONAS VAGINALIS STRAINS IN MAIDUGURI, NIGERIA
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	The content of the research reported is scientifically and technically sound. However, the manuscript will be greatly improved by a major review in the English use. The unities in which the minimum latent concentration and the minimum inhibitory concentration are reported in the abstract are not clear. Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? The authors must report if informed written consent was asked to the participants, as expected.	Thank you sir, I will conclude the consent and ethical approval
Minor REVISION comments	It is not clear how the authors determine the Minimal latent concentration (MLC) as compared with the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC). Please clarify in the methods section. Does MLC mean "minimal latent concentration" (as the abstract indicate) or "minimal lethal concentration" (as mentioned in discussion)?.	I will make the corrections, thank you.
Optional/General comments		