Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Scientific Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JSRR_87496**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of extraction techniques and evaluation of antimicrobial activity of Argemone Mexicana leaves and roots extracts in different solvents**
Type of the 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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	**(a) Introduction: Suggest author to have paragraphing. It is way too long and confusing** **(b) Introduction: Objective of the study cannot be found in the introduction and the justification of the study is explained vaguely. Author did not provide the justification and importance of extraction method of phytochemical extracts obtained from plants. Suggest author explain briefly in this session.** **(c) Materials and Methods: Suggest author define aqueous.** **(d) Materials and Methods: Suggest author cite the methodology conducted in this study.** **(e) Materials and Methods – Evaluation of Antimicrobial activity: Suggest author provides the details of the methodology including the standardisation of the CFU/mL culture loaded to the agar, the method author read the inhibition zone (how do you measure if the zone is either holo or clear), description of bacteriostatic or bacteriolytic. Justify the culture selection of this study.** **(f) Results and Discussion: Under extract yield, the author did not provide much of the explanations justifying the results. Suggest author provide how and why is the result with this extraction technique exhibiting much better than others.** **(g) Result and Discussion: Evaluation of antimicrobial activity: methanol and acetone were used in this study for sample extraction. Suggest author provide the information on proof that methanol and acetone are whether contributing to the inhibition activity. The statement did not explain clearly how is the extract exhibited inhibition activity against selected culture. Justification of the statement is inadequate.** **(h) Figure 1: The inhibition test shown on the agar did not show satisfactory due to few reasons: (i) Some of the cultured agar did not poured properly (did not cover the whole plate) which might leading invalidity of the result; (ii) The culture agar showed uneven distributed and questionable standardised bacteria/mold load on the agar (some cultures are not grown and covered the whole plate with dense manner). Therefore, the result shown on the result might be questionable. (iii) the inhibition zone shown on the agar is not well distributed. Suggest author explain how the zones were being measured (it is not round in shape).** **(i) Conclusion: Conclusion is not found in the manuscript**	
Minor REVISION comments	(a) Abstract: What is the unit of extract yield? (b) Abstract: The term (significant) cannot be used as there's no statistical analysis found in the manuscript. (c) Materials and Methods: Suggest author explain the sampling plan of the Argemone Mexicana. (d) Materials and Methods: Suggest author describe the details of the chemicals used in this study (Manufacturer and country of manufacture as examples)	
Optional/General comments	(a) General : Suggest author proofread the manuscript. (b) The manuscript emphasised the effect of the antimicrobial activities of Argemone Mexicana leaves and roots in different extraction techniques. The study consisting of antimicrobial activity against different types of bacteria and mold culture were exhibited differently. However, the manuscript did not describe the result with justification clearly. Asides from that, the methodology of agar well diffusion is not explained clearly and the findings obtained from the session results and discussion might be questionable due to its validity of the result. In this aspect, the whole manuscripts requires more justifications on the findings and evaluate the result as per stated in Compulsary revision (h).	

Review Form 1.6

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:	**Lee Fu Haw**
Department, University & Country	**Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia**