

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Microbiology Research Journal International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_MRJI_97764</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>In Vivo Antisalmonellal and Antioxidant Activity of 95% Hydroethanolic Extract of Bauhinia rufescens Leaves in Wistar Albino Rats Infected with Salmonella Typhi</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The purpose of this well-written study was to assess the antibacterial efficiency and antioxidant activity of a 95% hydroethanolic extract of <i>Bauhinia rufescens</i> (Fabaceae) leaves in rats experimentally infected with <i>Salmonella</i> Typhi ATCC6539 as an alternate therapy.</li> <li>❖ The title needs to be rephrased, as it is preferred to use antibacterial efficacy instead of antisalmonellal, as well as it is preferable not to mention the concentration of the extract in the title.</li> <li>❖ The abstract offers an accurate summary of the paper, and the language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand.</li> <li>❖ The manuscript is well designed and appropriate in terms of structure and organization.</li> <li>❖ The manuscript is scientifically outstanding.</li> <li>❖ Sufficient.</li> <li>❖ Both additions and corrections were outlined in red color.</li> <li>❖ Many of the words outlined in yellow should be deleted.</li> <li>❖ Please re-arrange the keywords alphabetically.</li> <li>❖ Tables: Comprehensive and clear.</li> <li>❖ It is preferred to use antibacterial efficacy instead of antisalmonellal along the article.</li> <li>❖ Figure (1) was not referred to in the text (the first section of materials and methods).</li> <li>❖ Ethical approval has been combined with a section (2.3.), it preferably it has a separate subheading that come at the beginning of the Materials and Methods (2.1.)</li> <li>❖ Salmonella-Shigella agar (Please provide the catalog number)</li> <li>❖ When referring to names by abbreviations, the full name is mentioned, followed by the abbreviation when it is mentioned for the first time, after which only the abbreviation is mentioned.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes, language quality is suitable</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ <b>In general</b>, the paper is well written, and the manuscript is relevant and informative.</li> <li>❖ <b>Title</b>: the title properly explains the purpose and objective of the article</li> <li>❖ <b>Abstract</b>: The abstract offers an accurate summary of the paper, and the language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand.</li> <li>❖ <b>Introduction</b>: The authors provide sufficient context on the subject.</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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>Manal Hadi Ghaffoori Kanaan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Technical Institute of Suwaria, Middle Technical University, Iraq</b>