

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_78030
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial activity of the methanolic leaf extract of some medicinal plants used by traditional birth attendants in Sokoto Metropolis
Type of the Article	Original 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>I see the need to use the methodology used! Mentioning the studies used in the methodologies are not enough for the article to be reproduced again if necessary. Thus, a detailed description of the methodology used in all analogues is essential.</p> <p>The authors duty descriptions. The reader must have this information to know if the methodology has failed or not.</p> <p>Ex.:</p> <p>1- Collection and Identification of Plant Materials</p> <p>-At what time of day was the material glued, what is the temperature and humidity at the time?</p> <p>- How was this material booked, under what conditions? Were the analyzes performed soon after the collection? How long did it take to extract the material?</p> <p>2- Listeria Isolation / Test Isolates</p> <p>- There are no details to know how this procedure is performed. A detailed description is required.</p> <p>3- Morphological and biochemical characteristics</p> <p>- It is not the reader's duty to look for the cited articles to understand how these tests were carried out. Maybe for the reviewer. What is the guarantee that the testicles were made minutely correct so that there was no interference?</p> <p>4- Molecular identification of the Listeria species</p> <p>- Same as the placements in item 3</p> <p>5- Phytochemical analysis</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>- Same as the placements in item 3 and 4</p> <p>6- Tests for antibacterial activity</p> <p>- Same as the placements in item 3, 4 and 5</p> <p>7- Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC)</p> <p>- Same as the placements in item 3, 4, 5 and 6</p> <p>8- Minimum bactericidal concentration (MBC)</p> <p>- Same as the placements in item 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7</p> <p>9- What statistical treatment was used?</p> <p>-See that there were many variables in the study. Types of fruits, types of active principles of different plants.</p> <p>Anyway! I believe that the work must be approved, I think the topic is very relevant and it has a great scientific and social importance. However, I think it is necessary to include the items mentioned above. It is essential to strengthen the results and discussion contained in this study.</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fernando Fabrizzi
Department, University & Country	Brazil