

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_91066
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial Screening of Jatropha tajorensis against Escherichia coli, Staphylococcus aureus and Pseudomonas aeruginosa
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.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/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>The study is a really interesting one. However, I have found many corrections, mentioned below.</p> <p>1. Abstract Abstract having very little information about the authors followed methodology and results. Need to add more information, particularly the results gained (statistics) and should modify them adequately. Authors should write the scientific names properly throughout the MS.</p> <p>2. Introduction The introduction is very poorly written. Flow is disturbed in some places and the value of the study is not highlighted. Used references are really old and should be replaced once writing the introduction again. Also, kindly elaborate on the purpose of your study. Highlight how your study is valid. Use the existing gaps in the literature and emphasise them. Increase the length of your introduction by at least up to 800 words. Once you mention the full name of the scientific name (Species and genus) again and again you no need to write it. Throughout the MS, you can use the first letter of the species name, full stop and genus name. Maintain the uniqueness throughout the MS. Don't mix it.</p> <p>3. Methodology The methodology is not written properly in many places. And the writing style is very poor. Should be written in a well-organised way. There should be a way of writing in a scientific way. Use of language. Also what about the replicates?</p> <p>4. Results The results section is also very poorly written. What about the results of the ANOVA test? All are tables? Think about the way of data representations. Also, why there are no any single photographs? Add a few photographs appropriately and re-write and present nicely the result section.</p> <p>5. Discussion Needs significant changes. Please maintain the flow. The factors are not clearly discussed. Use a few more previous findings and discuss more deeply, than the superficial discussion. The importance of your study should be highlighted even indirectly.</p> <p>6. Conclusion Not adequately written. Rewrite it.</p> <p>7. References Many are not written according to the journal guidelines. Please recheck all carefully and change it. Things in text citations should be listed in the reference list. Careful about those as well. About 80% of your references should be in the last 5 years. I suggest you to add at least several references from 2021 and 2022. (if 30-35 references can add, that's perfect)</p> <p>Please go through the attached MS with my other suggestions.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>Many mistakes including grammar, I have encountered. The paper should be re-write completely with the help of an expert scientific writer. However, I like to give a second chance to the authors to correct the MS as I suggested and resubmit for the second round of reviewing. All the best.</p>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A.K Hasith Priyashanatha
Department, University & Country	Eastern University, Sri Lanka