

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_104751
Title of the Manuscript:	Invitro interaction of essential oil of Cymbopogon citratus (Lemongrass) and ciprofloxacin against fluoroquinolone-resistant Staphylococcus aureus and Escherichia coli.
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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>1. The manuscript presents an important result for scientific community. Essential oil of <i>Cymbopogon citratus</i> has been demonstrated to have antibacterial activities. The main of this study was to evaluate the effects of combined use of <i>C. citratus</i> and ciprofloxacin against fluoroquinolone-resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> (FQSA) and <i>Escherichia coli</i> (FQEC).</p> <p>2. The title of the manuscript is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the manuscript is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes I think that the manuscript is correct.</p> <p>6. My suggestion is that the Author may actualized the references, with increment of the references more actualized.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>My suggestion is that the Authors could revise the spaces in all text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vera L. Petricevich
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autonoma del Estado de Morelos, Mexico