



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	Title. Please consider adding information that the antimycobacterial activity of n-hexane extracts was measured. As written the title is imprecise. Abstract Aims. Please consider revising as it is imprecise. Methodology Line 13. As novel extracts were used as the source of antimycobacterial activity, there is no "susceptible" M. tuberculosis strain, as the possible compounds have not been used. Quite possibly, the strain employed could have been resistant to the antimycobacterial compound(s) in the Ficus extracts. The strains should be described as susceptible to standard TB drugs (if that was the case). Results Lines 1-3. Combine by placing (100-400 µg/mL) in parenthesis after activity in line 1 and delete second sentence. Lines 3-4. "revealed no" should be replaced with lacked Line 8. Column for Colum Lines 8-11. Confusing, it is not clear which fraction had the lowest MIC. Please consider listing the MICs of the four fractions. Lines 11-13. How does the composition of the "phytochemicals" relate to the 4 column chromatographic fractions? 1.0 Introduction Lines 40-49. This paragraph can be deleted, as the important information is in the following paragraph focusing on Ficus as a natural remedy for TB. 2.0 Materials and Methods Lines 81-88. I am surprised that inspissation did not inactive the active agents in the extracts. I think that is worthy of comment. 3.0 Results and Discussion Line 116. Again, delete "susceptible" Table 1, Lines 119-122. There is no need for this table as it presents negative results that can be related in the text, as in Lines 124-133. Line 143. Fractions (plural) Lines 142-145. Were fractions B, C, and D pooled to obtain Fraction B-D? Table 1.3, Lines 173-177. Where is the activity of Fraction A? Lines 199-230. Please consider titling this section as Discussion and delete "and Discussion" from the tile of 3.0 Results and Discussion. Lines 199-230. This section is no a discussion of the results, but speculation as to a possible mechanism of anti-mycobacterial activity. Please consider presenting a critical analysis of the experimental approach (any limitations of the extraction or of the MIC measurement?), variation in the results (note that single results are presented, what about replicates?), and the role of the 5 "phytochemicals" listed in Table 1.2 (which was present in Fraction B, the most active fraction?). Lines 199-230. Was the MIC of the individual 5 phytochemicals listed in Table 1.2 measured? Such knowledge would certainly focus the speculation of the mechanism of action.	Title Three solvents were used, screening and extracts is now included Abstract Aims- Noted and revised Methodology Noted and revised Results Noted and revised Line 11-13 – Phytochemicals are from the crude n-hexane Ficus sycomorus fruit extract and not from the column chromatographic fractions as such it is made clear on the table now Introduction 1.0- Noted 2.0- I followed standard protocol for inspissations of media containing TB drugs and the extracts were evaluated for the same activity which one day if it is found worthy to be amongst the TB drugs will be used the same way as such that is why the extracts were also inspissated at the same temperature as for standard drugs and from all indication since the medium was able to stop the growth of these bacilli that show inspissations never had effect on the extracts 3.0 Results and Discussion Line116- Noted Table 1 It those not only present negative result but most of the results are negative and all tables must have explanations Line 143-Noted Line 142-145- No it is revised as B, C & D, Line 173-177- Fraction A lacked activity at the very highest concentration so it was not not evaluated for MIC Line 199-230- Noted Results and Discussion Noted and the Discussion was revised. The phytochemicals were not measured for MIC but a speculation to what the crude n-hexane Ficus sycomorus contain. It was The MIC of the three fractions that was only measured.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		