

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_105252
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Diameter of Inhibition in Crowded Plates on the In-vitro Inhibitory Strength of Potential Antibiotic-Producing Bacteria isolated from some natural habitats
Type of the Article	Original Research 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
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. However, the results are not so encouraging and the conclusion was so simple. 2. The title of the article is suitable. However, the scope of this work is quite restricted. 3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. The last two sentences are written as conclusions. 4. Some paragraphs presented in the Results session are more appropriate to be placed in the Introduction session as they support the purpose of the article (see revised article). 5. I think the manuscript is scientifically very limited. For comparative purposes, the planning of this work should have considered the use of methods other than the diameter of inhibition. 6. The references are sufficient. Some of them are not so up to date. <p>Corrections are highlighted in the attached document. In green colour, suggested corrections are marked. In yellow colour, it is highlighted what of the original text must be revised and blue colour some comments to take in account.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article is well written but the results are very simple</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:	Jairo Antonio Cubillos Lobo
Department, University & Country	Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, Colombia