

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJFAR_119884
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative studies on antibacterial potentials of Cassia fistula and Carica papaya leaf extract against selected fish pathogens.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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, the manuscript seems important to the scientific community. Yet, this work is a very basic baseline data in the current scenario. This kind of work need deep bench work including in vivo and in silico works</p> <p>“fish pathogens” in the title may be modified as “aquatic pathogens”</p> <p>The abstract has 300 words, and I hope it is as per the journal guidelines.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Most of the references were around 2010 which indicates how old these studies were conducted. Try to include recent references (Minimum 75%).</p> <p>There are a lot of issues in the manuscript</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scientific names were provided wrongly in many places • Lot of spelling mistakes throughout the manuscript • Too many grammatical errors • It is not necessary to give a full scientific name at every point. Only at the first use, the full name is required • Unnecessarily italics and capital letters were used in many places • Taxonomic family name is in small letter • Few scientific names were not italicised • Disease names have spelling mistakes • The phytochemical analysis can be described briefly in the methodology section • No figures were provided with the manuscript. It is mandatory for this work as proof to check the zone of inhibition. • Why aqueous extraction was chosen instead of methanol or chloroform extracts? • What are the possibilities to use these extracts in the aquaculture field? Is it feasible? • Conclusion seems like a repetition, as seen in earlier sections. It can be rewritten with clarity. • The introduction seems very lengthy. It can be reduced. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is better to check for plagiarism, grammatical error corrections and spelling mistakes. This careless mistake from the first page may worry the reader and won't have much impact on the scientific community.</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:	B. Naveen Rajeshwar
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Central Institute of Fisheries Education, India