

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77102
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial efficacy of Herbal root canal irrigants and 3% sodium hypochlorite against <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i> : An In Vitro Study
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<p>The manuscript aimed to compare the antibacterial potency of Aqueous Nigella sativa extract, Aqueous Neem leaf extract, and 3% Sodium Hypochlorite. However, some points deserve to be clarified before publication. I recommend the publication with minor revisions as follows:</p> <p>Abstract fails to report the principal and novelty of the work. Besides, it seems too short and I recommend stating briefly an introduction of the process plus adding some of the achievements briefly to attract readers.</p> <p>The introduction part is well-written, and the area of the work is adequately discussed. The literature review is done properly, and the authors successfully show the novelty of their works by comparing them to previous pieces of literature.</p> <p>The methodology is adequately discussed and the results are perfectly shown in the table, however, I highly recommend that to compare achieved data with some of the published ones in the past and highlighting the importance of this research to readers.</p> <p>The majority of the references are outdated and recommend citing some recently published papers in this area.</p> <p><b>General comments:</b>            Test solution were tested against <i>E. faecalis</i> (ATCC 29212)... Test solutions were tested against <i>E. faecalis</i> (ATCC 29212).            results shows that Aqueous Nigella sativa extract... results show that Aqueous Nigella sativa extract.            incubated at 37 °C, and adjusted to an optical density... incubated at 37 °C and adjusted to an optical density.            was wrapped in a muslin fabric and soaked.... was wrapped in muslin fabric and soaked</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Soroush Soltani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia</b>