

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Microbiology Research Journal International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_125946
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial activity of xylopiia aethiopica extract on microorganisms associated with the the spoilage of vegetables in mile 3 market, portharcourt.
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is very significant for the scientific and academic community. <b>ANTIMICROBIAL ACTIVITY OF XYLOPIA AETHIOPICA EXTRACT ON MICROORGANISMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE THE SPOILAGE OF VEGETABLES IN MILE 3 MARKET, PORTHARCOURT</b> is significantly described in the manuscript. The current research work in the aforesaid manuscript is the need of the hour and is well justified.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title can be reframed as more specific and to the point highlighting the entire research objectives in the above manuscript.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The word limit of the abstract can be rechecked with the author guidelines and as per the journal requirements.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the structure and subsections are appropriate but the subheadings such as Conflict of Interest and Acknowledgements can also be included in the above manuscript.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, the manuscript is logically and scientifically structured.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are few, some more recent years specific references must also be incorporated. The supporting references must be relevant to the above-mentioned research work and must be quoted wherever required.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, the language is reader friendly and suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	NIL	

#### 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:	Dhananjay Pandey
Department, University & Country	Govt. Naveen Girls College, Surajpur, India