

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_126264
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical screening and antibacterial activity of <i>Cassia sieberiana</i> DC. (Fabaceae) and <i>Zanthoxylum zanthoxyloides</i> (Lam.) Zepernick et Timler (Rutaceae) leaves extracts on <i>Escherichia coli</i> involved in urinary tract infections.
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
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.	Rewrite the abstract part.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	The entire text should be carefully checked for language errors and misprints. The overall quality of writing should be improved. Rewrite the conclusion part with key results. Adding more references recently last 3 years.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Adding more references recently last 3 years.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The entire text should be carefully checked for language errors and misprints.	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chandrahasya M. Nandanwar
Department, University & Country	Nevjabai Hitkarini College, India