

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_89996
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Phytochemical and Antibacterial Potential of Vernonia amygdalina and Elaeis guineensis on some Bacteria Associated with Diarrhea
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalmrji.com/index.php/MRJI/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	<p>1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, the words "from diarrheic" may be as "from the diarrheic"; "Undiluted" as "The undiluted"; "using sterile" as "using a sterile"; "the phytochemical" as "phytochemical"; "using pH" as "using a pH"; "was 6.9" as "were 6.9"; "of lack" as "of the lack"; "for as" as "as"; "ailment is" as "ailments are"; "has passed" as "has been passed"; "further" as "a further"; "high" as "a high"; "are common" as "are a common"; "a frequent" as "frequent"; "options of" as "options for"; "Medical" as "The medical"; "for few" as "for a few"; "in clean" as "in the clean"; "extract stored" as "extract was stored"; "were properly" as "was properly"; "to bacterial" as "to a bacterial"; "a sterile nutrient" as "sterile nutrient"; "as positive" as "as a positive"; "of small" as "of a small"; "7 was" as "7 were"; "in bitter" as "in the bitter"; "the greater" as "a greater"; "on food borne" as "of food-borne"; "extract of" as "extracts of"; "is indicated on table" as "indicated in Table"; "to shrink and caused" as "shrink and causing"; "to low" as "to the low". The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p> <p>2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, the words "undiluted extracts" may be as "undiluted extract"; "of plants" as "of plant"; "in African" as "in Africa"; "supplement," as "supplements,"; "usually last" as "usually, lasts"; "multi drug" as "multi-drug"; "sample of" as "samples of"; "hundred gram" as "hundred grams"; "24hours" as "24 hours"; "a sterilize" as "a sterilized"; "different concentration" as "different concentrations"; "pocket sized" as "pocket-sized"; "pHep" as "pH"; "bitterleaf" as "bitter leaf"; "table 2" as "Table 2"; "water soluble" as "water-soluble"; "diarrhea causing organism" as "diarrhea-causing organisms"; "multidrug resistant" as "multidrug-resistant"; "resistance to" as "resistant to"; "all concentration" as "all concentrations"; "pathogen." as "pathogens."; "Gram negative" as "Gram-negative"; "been the" as "being the"; "In conclusion" as "In conclusion,"; "disc compare" as "disc compared". The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly.</p> <p>3. In the introduction, the authors are encouraged to included the prevalence or incidence data about diarrhea with recent reference.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, Rivers State University Teaching Hospital (RSUTH), etc.). And it should be in both abstract as well as in the remaining part of the manuscript. Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words need to be abbreviated.</p> <p>2. The full form of the species should be given when the first time appears in both the abstract and in the remaining part of the manuscript and it should be followed by only the first letter of the genus (e.g., <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> / <i>Elaeis guineensis</i> when the first time appears and followed by <i>V. amygdalina</i> / <i>E. guineensis</i>).</p> <p>3. In conclusion, the authors may be included the limitation of the present findings and future direction for a better understanding of the manuscript.</p>	
Optional/General comments	The authors have put effort to evaluate the "Evaluation of Phytochemical and Antibacterial Potential of Vernonia amygdalina and Elaeis guineensis on some Bacteria Associated with Diarrhea". The authors describe the research undertaken with this in an organized manner, emphasizing the results obtained by them. The article needs modification for better cohesion of information to achieve the goal and the minor shortcomings which need to be considered. Hence, the paper can be accepted after MINOR REVISIONS are carried out.	

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:	A. Vijaya Anand
Department, University & Country	Bharathiar University, India