

## 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	1. What is the rational behind selection of Vernonia amygdalina, Ocimum gratissimum and Gongronema latifolium for Antimicrobial Activity. 2. Data need to explore more as antimicrobial activity study carried out then photographs of zone of inhibition should be given. 3. Antimicrobial Activity of Vernonia amygdalina, Ocimum gratissimum and Gongronema latifolium carried out so comparative results should be given 4. - Why Combination of hot Extract and -Combination of cold extract selected . any supportive justifying material, then clarify it 4. Combination of extract word used as you havecombined two or three extract but experimental method does not reflect it. clarify it. or change word used 5. reference number for bacterial species should be mentioned 6. Formatting is necessary	1. The authors have stated the rationale behind the choice of leaves in the study. Thank you so much for drawing our attention to it. 2. A photograph of zone of inhibition has been included. 3. We have rearranged the results in the table such that a comparison is made between the leaf extracts. Thank you so much for this great input. 4. We have clearly stated the procedure adopted in the study. Extract from a combination of leaves was tested against each isolate. Cold, hot and ethanolic extract were employed separately. Thank you so much for your observation. 5. The bacterial isolates were obtained from food samples. They were not characterized using molecular methods which should have been given reference number. We will use bacterial isolates in that category in future studies. Thank you. 6. We have formatted the manuscript in line with the journal specification.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	-	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	