



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_63861
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Bactericidal and Fungicidal efficacy of Strychno spotatorum Linn.(Nirmali) seeds.
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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	<p>The English needs to be more consideration and revision. For example, in abstract “they have been correlated with socioeconomic, and environmental, ecological factors.” or “for antimicrobial agents preferably of plant origin due to their availability, accessibility, and affordability.” Please check all punctuation in the text.</p> <p>Some references were not cited truly in the body of text, and some were not mentioned. For example, in the last paragraph of introduction.</p> <p>The introduction was written very briefly; it should be better the proposed method was clarified in the last paragraph of introduction.</p> <p>In material and methods, Four Gram positive bacteria (Staphylococcus aureus, the Braces was not closed and is repeated in after</p> <p>This section is not appropriate for declaration Bacterial and Fungal strains and growth medium. Why the error (false discovery rate) from the experiments is not written in the tables.</p> <p>In section “Results and discussion” it is not clear that what result is related to the experiments and what is related to the other researches? Please re-write this section.</p> <p>In results section, the authors put forwarded that “Among the Gram positive bacteria, B. subtilis showed a larger diameter of clearance than that of other Gram positive bacteria used in the present study.” Is B. subtilis one of the bacteria in your Study? It is not in Table 1.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The conclusion is not written very clearly.</p> <p>Can you explain why chloramphenicol is appropriate as positive control in your study??</p> <p>Table 3, “Antifungal activity” is not clear for me! May be in review version it is not shown clearly.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>In results and discussion section the authors wrote: “The ultimate goal is to offer appropriate and efficient antimicrobial drugs to the patient” what is the main meaning of GOAL, is your goal? Or why did you mention it? What is your reason?</p> <p>The authors in results section stated “The results of the present study” but it is not clear which results they refer to them? Also in 7 paragraph in this section.</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amirhossein Fathinaid
Department, University & Country	University of Tehran, Iran