



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_21386
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial properties of leaf extracts of Moringa oleifera Lam. growing in Sudan
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	Abstract: Mention the pathogens tested "revealed different degrees"???? Provide the actual result/observation. The conclusion is not supported by the data, hence not valid but could serve as an extrapolation of the actual conclusion. Therefore, the authors need to state the conclusion of their observations in relation to the antibacterial properties of the extracts against the tested pathogens. Introduction Line13: after 'alarming', insert 'and necessitated' Line 16: Change 'features' to 'properties' Line 16-20 not adequately referenced Line 26: use lower case for those phytochemicals Line 28: delete 'are' Results and Discussion The presentation is not exhaustive enough. The authors need to save the readers the trouble of deciphering the intricate highlights of the result. Thus, it is the prerogative of the authors to point out the major highlights of the result in a well written presentation and to discuss the highlighted observation by stating the implication(s) and comparing same with the results of similar but earlier studies by other researchers.	Changes added in the abstract. The line was deleted since the actual results are mentioned in the next line. The conclusion was changed totally. Done. Done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Table and Figure should not be used for the same set of result. Use either.	The figure deleted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	CONCLUSION Delete 'Morenga oleifera is a miracle medicinal plant prescribed in traditional medicine since antiquity against different aliments.' Replace 'was found to have' with 'exhibited' Delete 'Too many studies on oleifera from different localities around the world support this claim.' Delete 'It is time now for the scientific community to take positive steps in order' Insert 'Further studies are needed to isolate these antibacterial substances, to innovate new natural antibiotics derived from such medicinal plants to face the recent disastrous spread of multi-drug resistant bacteria.'	The entire conclusion changed.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors may split the table into two for Gram positive and Gram negative pathogens.	Done.