



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_41462
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Claims of Microbiological Activity and Microbiological Quality of Some Oral Herbal Medicinal Products Sold in Port-Harcourt Metropolis
Type of the 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	<p>Kindly check the following comments that may help:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In title, you may write microbial contamination instead of microbial activity. 2. In fig. 2.6 why no testing results for rest of products? 3. Add phytochemical screening procedures in material and methods part. 4. Reference 11 is incomplete. 5. References are too few and insufficient. 	<p>The herbal products claimed to have antimicrobial effect or activity. The study therefore aimed to ascertain the veracity of these claims and the overall microbial quality of the said products. We consider the title appropriate and a true reflection of the study carried out.</p> <p>Fig.2.6 shows results for only the products that actually exhibited antibacterial activity against some clinical isolates in vitro. Contrary to the claim of antibacterial activity, majority of the products exhibited none. The phytochemical screening was done using appropriate standard tests which are indicated against each constituent in the result and any interested reader can get further details from standard texts in phytochemistry or pharmacognosy. That was not the major focus of this study.</p> <p>Reference 11 has now been corrected and completed. The articles and sources cited are the major ones consulted in the course of the study.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		