

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_109234
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIBACTERIAL ACTIVITIES OF CLOVE EXTRACTS ON VEGETABLE SPOILAGE BACTERIA.
Type of the Article	

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>1. I think the title of this manuscript is not suitable and should be modified to capture the contents of the manuscript. We could have 'Antibacterial and phytochemical properties of clove (<i>Syzigium aromaticum</i>) extracts on vegetable spoilage bacteria'</p> <p>2. The abstract needs to be rewritten. Yes, it states the aim of the research as well as the results. But the author failed to report the techniques, methods and conclusion of the research. The abstract was too wordy and above 300 words contrary to that stated in the author guidelines.</p> <p>3. The subsections of this manuscript are fairly correct. There are points where the author failed to align with the subsections. As an example, the biochemical tests were not clearly outlined in subsection 2.6.2. In addition, the author failed to combine the 'Results and Discussions' in section 3.</p> <p>4. The scientific quality of this paper is good. The paper presented the information in a straightforward and understandable manner. The scientific methods are valid and clearly outlined.</p> <p>5. References cited are recent. However, the style of referencing differs with the journal style of referencing. Also, not all references cited in the text were included in the reference list. As an example; Liu <i>et al.</i>, 2017, Cheesbrough, 2000 and Okafor, 2022 were not included in the reference list.</p> <p>6. General comments: The author should revisit the journals guide to authors and adhere strictly to all instructions outlined</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the manuscript is well written.	
<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:	Hafsat Muhammad Oladunni
Department, University & Country	Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Nigeria