

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_84761
Title of the Manuscript:	Properties and Effect of Fresh Concentrated Extract of Garlic on Different Bacteria and Fungi
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:

(<https://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/editorial-policy>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Dear,</p> <p>Congratulations on the initiative, a very relevant topic.</p> <p>It is important that you address the issue of antimicrobial resistance, it is a public health disease that causes several deaths.</p> <p>However, I have some considerations for improvements for your work:</p> <p>Item 3.1 contains a lot of text. I suggest that you can for example put this data in a table, or an experimental flowchart.</p> <p>Graph 1 has no legend, which makes it impossible to interpret the results.</p> <p>Review the data in figure 9, data is missing.</p> <p>In figure 1, the control was confusing, I don't understand you using some standard antibiotic? known?</p> <p>Improve the quality of images;</p> <p>In figure 12 - review the dilution of: 2.- C. albicans 10 x10⁶ yeast/mL without EGGF (10?) or was it a typing error?</p> <p>Figure 15, too dark, improve the quality.</p> <p>Mention the protocol used in the methodology;</p> <p>In conclusion, you concluded:</p> <p>2.- The different concentrations of GFEG analyzed have the same inhibitory effect.</p> <p>3.- As the concentration of C. albicans yeasts increases, the effectiveness of the EGGF partially decreases.</p> <p>It was not concluded (2) that the GFR differences occurred the same, please review;</p> <p>Also review the need for testing fungi and bacteria, focusing on groups only, eg yeasts and aspergillus due to their epidemiological and virulence characteristics.</p> <p>I suggest better organizing the text, mainly in the methodological part.</p>	<p>1.- Item 3.1 In was corrected in the text</p> <p>2.- Figure 1. It was corrected in the text.</p> <p>3.- The control is the FCEG without dilution. We do not use antibiotics like reference.</p> <p>4.- Quality of the images. It was corrected in the text.</p> <p>5.- Figure 12. It was corrected in the text. We use two controls without FCEG with 1 and 10 x 10⁶ yeast/mL.</p> <p>6.- Figure 15, It was corrected in the text.</p> <p>7.- Mention the protocol used in the methodology. It was corrected in the text</p> <p>8.- conclusion: All was corrected in the text.</p> <p>9.- need for testing fungi and bacteria, focusing on groups only, eg yeasts and aspergillus due to their epidemiological and virulence characteristics.</p> <p>We are working in this section to isolate fungi and yeasts from hospital patients, related to the topic.</p> <p>10.- I suggest better organizing the text, mainly in the methodological part.</p> <p>We corrected this in the text.</p>
Optional/General comments		

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>	