

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_117281
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical composition, antibacterial activities against multi-resistant strains of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> and <i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> of the bark extract of <i>Ficus platyphylla</i> Dell. Holl.
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</b> 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. Somewhat important. But the originality issue is under question.</p> <p>2. Title is ok</p> <p>3. The abstract is not comprehensive. It should show, the background, objective, methods, results, and conclusion.</p> <p>4. The subsection lacks detail. For example, the introduction says nothing about the research gap, the novelty of the work, and the like. Under the Antibacterial study, the method used is not indicated.</p> <p>5. It is correct.</p> <p>6. References are old and need to include recent ones and the way it is written is not uniform.</p> <p>*. In the Discussion part, the Author has used two types of citation.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	almost good	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Can be considered if all the comment given above is incorporated and seems good to the editor also.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Asnake Lealem Berhanu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wollega University, Ethiopia</b>