

## 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 <i>Cassia fistula</i> and <i>Carica papaya</i> leaf extract against selected fish pathogens.
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 his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Author investigated the antibacterial efficacy of <i>Cassia fistula</i> and <i>Carica papaya</i> leaf extracts against selected fish pathogens such as <i>Aeromonas. hydrophila</i>, <i>Vibrio. parahaemolyticus</i>, <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>, <i>Proteus mirabilis</i> and <i>Micrococcus luteus</i>. <b>It is routine work.</b></p> <p>2. <b>Article is suitable</b></p> <p>3. <b>Abstract should be modified in view of scientific novelty.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Yes subsections and sections are correct</b></p> <p>5. <b>Yes, Manuscript is scientifically ok.</b></p> <p>6. <b>No, References should be updated and latest references of last three should be given.</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>NO</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. Why author choose <i>Cassia fistula</i> and <i>Carica papaya</i> leaf extract</p> <p>2. Introduction should be shortened.</p> <p>3. Author should check grammatical and typographical error throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Reference should be uniform.</p> <p>5. Abbreviation should be given at first used.</p> <p>6. Graphical abstract should be drawn in better way.</p> <p>7. Author has given the reference <b>sign et al.</b> Not found in bibliography</p> <p>8. References 30 and 31 wrongly cited.</p> <p>9. Reference cited in text and bibliography is different</p> <p>10. Latest references of last three years should be given</p> <p>11. In my opinion author have done routine work.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rizwan Arif</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lingaya's Vidyapeeth, India</b>