

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_101770
Title of the Manuscript:	Wound Healing Effects of Bacteriocin extracted from Lactobacillus rhamnosus WE1-30 in P. aeruginosa infected mice model.
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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The title can be suggested for alternative, for example; "Effects of bacteriocin from extracted from <i>Lactobacillus rhamnosus</i> on wound healing"</p> <p>The abstract should be re-write (see comments in manuscript attached)</p> <p>No, see more comments and suggestions in manuscript attached Some of the methods should give more details and some is missing (see comments in manuscript)</p> <p>Yes, however, some methods should be added more information, references, and more explanation</p> <p>Some of references in the body of manuscript are not in the journal's format (see comments in manuscript)</p> <p>Abstract - should be re-write Introduction -should be covered with the main experiment, for example how leucocyte is important and its mechanism Methods – some of methods/ protocols are missing and it is not clear. Authors should provide more about the assay, for example to grow/culture bacteria in anaerobic condition.. how? (see comments in manuscript) Results- should write in sufficient, for example in 3.1, 3.2 ...</p> <p>Numbering are also mix up (see manuscript)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Siripuk Suraporn
Department, University & Country	Maharakham University, Thailand