



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_34644
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIMICROBIAL ACTIVITY OF PLEUROTUS SQUARROSULUS ON CLINICAL PATHOGENIC BACTERIA AND FUNGI
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Introduction is not good and the majority of references are not recent (before 2010). It should start in line 42, the information before that do not enrich the text. Line 48-54: references? What is "clean water"? Deionized water? Distilled water? Sterilized water? Line 99: why different times periods for bacteria (24) and yeasts (72h)? Reference 23 is correct!? Reference 18: the only one with "et al." Subtitles 2.8 and 2.9 should be aggregated. Only the medium, time and temperature changes because of the microorganisms. Figures 1, 2 and 3: the bars are difficult to see. Maybe some in bold, others with other types of scheme. Fluconazole and Gentimicine are ever worst. And the same scheme should be used for the same variety. In my opinion, descriptive statistics should calculate the average differences between groups with the independent samples t-student test or Mann-Whitney test. Results must be analyzed with the new tests. Line 135-139: is similar to the introduction. Line 142-143: is the sentence correct? "The MIC of ethanolic extract of <i>P. squarrosulus</i> varied between <u>15.63 and 31.25</u> mg/ml with MBC of <u>15.63 to 31.25</u> mg/ml." From line 140-171, this description is too long and repetitive, should be reformulated. Line 172: "has <u>similar</u> antimicrobial properties" ? Line 173-175: grammar incongruence. The two last sentences of the results and discussion must be re-write. I think this conclusion is very advanced; more information is needed before clinical evaluation of mushrooms through in vivo based research.</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The sensitivity of isolates to the mushroom extracts implies that intrinsic substance in the extracts is unknown to the microorganisms, which made it impossible for them to resist: this could be mention as a new item to the future.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Patricia Diogo</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Dentistry Department, University of Coimbra, Portugal</i>