



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_38201
Title of the Manuscript:	In Vitro Antimycobacterial activity of Ficus sycomorus on susceptible strain of Mycobacterium tuberculosis
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	Article structure 1- Where are author(s contributions and Acknowledgments (if any) as required by journal policy? 2- Where is your discussion section? 3- It is better to use sub-section for results and discussion because it is not easy to identify each part in this section Abstract 1- Aims: Avoid capital letter in some words 2- "in vitro" and not "In Vitro" 3- No reference in abstract. Please correct accordingly 4- Why (M-Tb) in bracket? Please correct (line 4, result section). 5- Last sentence: alkaloid and not Alkaloid; avoid bracket Keywords: 6- Why square brackets at the beginning and parenthesis at the end of keywords Introduction 7- In 2009, 9.4 million new TB cases,.....Please since 2009 is this value still valid to date????????? 8- Line 36: M. tuberculosis 9- Line 38: TB 10- Line 41: ethanobotanical ???? Problematic and hypothesis: Why authors didn't make mention of previous works on antimycobacterial activity. You should emphasize relevant literature and therefore let me know what is the relevance of your work. How can you justify your study knowing that your plant have been previously screened for such activity? (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315130598_Screening_of_Zambian_Ficus_species_for_antibacterial_and_antimycobacterial_activity; http://tpr.iau-shahrood.ac.ir/article_531709_ca41f3d55a966df0922faf00e511f085.pdf.....) Material and methods 11- Line 81: NRA???? When using abbreviation, word should be written entirely for its first appearance following by abbreviation in brackets and then you can continue using abbreviation. 12- Line 82: INH ????. See line 81 and correct accordingly. 13- Line 91: std. ????. See Line 81 14- Line 91: the1:10 space 15- Line 94: Duration of incubation???? 16- Where is statistical analysis section??? Results and discussion 17- Line 119: 1.1 Anti-mycobacterial.....What does this title refers to? Where is table 1.1 title??? 18- It is better to write table1 and not table 1.1 19- Avoid capital letter in tables. Use it at the beginning of each word. 20- CONC, RIF and INH. Please use legend when your abbreviation is not conventional. It should be clearly defined. 21- Tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.....Comments should appear before tables. 22- Footnotes should be placed below the table with superscript lowercase letters. 23- Line 185-186: What does this figure or image (Plates B, C and D) refers to? Where is his title? Comments? 24- Lines 189-190: What does this title refers to? Is it for plates B, C and D? If yes refer it to figure. Your tubes should be numbered. Make sure that your figure or image can be well understand without reference to the text (which do not exist here). 25- Figures should be self-explanatory. Use appropriate caption 26- Line 191: D-CONC (Drug control), M-CONC (Media control): What does it mean??? 27- What is your discussion? 28- Lines 193-230 refer to which part of your work? Is it discussion? If yes it should be titled.	Article structure 1- It was their on the initial manuscript, but we have recaptured it again 2- Discussion in a sub-section now and reviewed 3- Noted and reviewed Abstract 1- Noted 2- Noted 3- Noted 4- Corrected 5- Noted and corrected Keywords: 6- Corrected in square bracket now Introduction 7- It is not valid 2016 survey captured 8- Noted 9- Noted 10- It rephrase as appropriate Problematic and hypothesis Previous works on antimycobacterial activity was captured but those align well at the time of the initial discussion, as such it is rephrase now some additional previous work. The relevance of this work is, I, We were able to evaluate bioactive component in <i>Ficus sycomorus</i> fruit extract in relation to their antimycobacterial activity which were very scanty especially in Nigeria. What we normally find is their ethanobotanical importance. II, We were able to partially purify the bioactive components in <i>Ficus sycomorus</i> fruit extracts. On the issues of justifying this study, I, Most of the works done on <i>Ficus sycomorus</i> were cantered on stem bark, Leaves and roots. II, For example the research from above screening of <i>Zambian Ficus</i> species was done on their roots, Leaves & Stem bark likewise the other Journal you presented by Mohd Shagal Hassan et al was done on stem barks only from about different 10 plants including <i>Ficus sycomorus</i> and it was evaluated on <i>M. bovis</i>. III, The bioactive components one will identify in the same plants from different region differs. These plants are affected with environmental conditions ranging from soil fertility, PH , water, sunlight, humidity etc



SDI Review Form 1.6

	29- Line 197: inoculation or inoculum???? 30- Line 211: For which assertion is reference 19? Please correct it accordingly. 31- Line 224: Spaonin ????? 32- Why authors just emphasized the result of hexane fraction? Please discuss the absence of activity of aqueous and methanol extracts also. Conclusion 33- Why authors divided it in two sections? References 34- In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets and not in parenthesis 35- Some of your references (probably all of them) are not well written. Please carefully follow the author's guidelines on this matter.	Material and methods 11- 14 It observed and corrected accordingly 15- Noted and corrected as 21 days 16- Most of the data generated are qualitative data except for the Phytochemical that we used ANOVA Results and discussion 17- 19 Noted and corrected 20- Noted, Key is under each table 21- Noted 22-Noted 23- They refer to MIC medium for the three fractions and reviewed accordingly, the title is on top of the plates and the comments relates to the comments made on table 3. 24- Corrected 25-corrected 26- D-CONC (Drug control) that is control with standard TB drugs, M-CONC (Media control) Control without drugs which serves to validate the assay either to continue reading the Drug susceptibility (DST) or not which are always in triplicate of which you will read on the 7, 14 & 21 days depending on the one which pass. 27-28 Noted and Discussion is reviewed 29-31- Noted and corrected accordingly. 32- Because the positive result was obtained from the hexane fraction but other are now also discussed Conclusion It is in the same section but different paragraph of which the first paragraph is conclusion and the second is recommendation References 34-35 Noted and corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		