



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 manuscript IN VITRO COMPARISON OF METRONIDAZOLE AND TINIDAZOLE ACTIVITY AGAINST TRICHOMONAS VAGINALIS STRAINS IN MAIDUGURI, NIGERIA shows the comparative approach for targeting the pathogen with chemical drugs under consideration. I think apart from lack of novelty and originality, the article also lacks the approach for studying these two compounds. For acceptance, some more studies should be carried out as just concentration effect is insufficient for its validation or for the acceptance of these work!	Thank you for this great comment, but little work has been done in this regard. So your observations and comments will definitely make this work one of its kind. And I am ready to effect all the corrections.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		