

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_85380
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial Activity of Vernonia amygdalina, Ocimum gratissimum and Gongronema latifolium Synergy on Common Foodborne Pathogenic Bacteria
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://www.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Complete the data with positive and negative control and concentration test.  Why the obtained data did not match with the reported data should be explained clearly because the test used here did not use the positive control. Therefore, it could be assumed that there was a mistake in the process such as the bacteria that is not fully developed.	We will involve positive and negative control in future studies as well as concentration test which will also involve the use of bacterial isolates with reference number. We have also captured the importance of this test in the Discussion. Thank you for your suggestions.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Complete the data with deviation standard value  include the explanation focused on which substances that are actually in charge of giving the activity based on the literature study.	We have calculated standard deviation for readings taken with regards to zone of inhibition. Thank you so much for pointing this out for us.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The background of this research is not quite clear and the result obtained cause could conflict with the existing research. Therefore, additional data are required for further verification.	We have provided possible reasons why the result obtained in the study is not in agreement with earlier studies in the discussion. Thank you so much for bringing this to our attention.

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	