

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_93207
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial Screening of <i>Annona muricata</i> and <i>Jatropha tanjorensis</i> against <i>Escherichia coli</i> , <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> and <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>
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.journalsajrm.com/index.php/SAJRM/editorial-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Title: I suggest to revise the title to be more specific for the plant part that was studied in this manuscript. Likewise, follow the proper writing of scientific name of plants such as writing of family name after the scientific name and italicized or underline them. Herewith, is the suggested title "Antibacterial Screening of Leaves Extracts of <i>Annona muricata</i> (Annonaceae) and <i>Jatropha tanjorensis</i> (Euphorbiaceae) against <i>Escherichia coli</i>, <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> and <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i></p> <p>Abstract: I suggest to include the identity of the plant part that was used in the study for better understanding of the reader and use the word antibacterial instead of antimicrobial since the test organism used in the study are bacteria only. Antimicrobial is a broad term.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction: Mispelled Euphorbiacea, revised to Euphorbiaceae</p> <p>Materials and Methods: I suggest to include in your methodology the protocol for quantifying the phytoconstituents present as the results were reflected in Table 1. Indicate the instrumentation used in the study for better understanding. Based on the written protocol, my understanding is that the phytochemistry conducted was confirmatory test only, it will not quantify. However, a quantity was reflected in table 1 and indicate also the unit of measurement.</p> <p>Properly observed also the correct writing of symbol such as mL for millilitre.</p> <p>Conclusion: I suggest to revised the word antimicrobial to antibacterial since your test organisms are bacteria only.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anna Muriel T. Jacinto
Department, University & Country	Industrial Technology Development, Institute-Department of Science and Technology, Philippines