

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_105051
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIMICROBIAL ACTIVITY OF SOME SPICES AGAINST POTENTIAL PROBIOTIC BACTERIA ENTEROCOCCUS HIRAE ISOLATED FROM RAW SHEEP MILK
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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1-Yes It is an Exciting Study to Explain of the Antimicrobial Activity of Some Spices Against Potential Probiotic Bacteria Enterococcus Hirae Isolated From Raw Sheep Milk.</p> <p>2- Yes The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3- Yes The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4- ABSTRACT 1. INTRODUCTION 2. EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM 2.1. Apparatus and Procedures 2.2. Experimental Procedure 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 3.1. Results 4. CONCLUSIONS REFERENCES</p> <p>5- Study is scientifically valid but poor in the more scientific discussion.</p> <p>6- References are insufficient and require adding recent scientific researches in (2022-2023).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<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:	Naser Korde Zedin
Department, University & Country	University of Technology, Iraq