

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	Research

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 <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.	urinary tract infections are very common and Escherichia coli is the most common bacteria that causes urinary tract infections (UTIs). Natural products used for the UTIs are limited , therefore research on natural products for this purpose may be encouraged. SEE ATTACHMENT	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	CAN BE REVISED	
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.	All the mistakes are mentioned in the manuscript draft itself. the authors made a lot of spelling mistakes, should be rectified. the relevant details like strain number and procuring details of bacteriae used can be included in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some tables titles are found to be in different language other than English, must be rectified	
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 manuscript should be thoroughly revised , relevant photos regarding the zone of inhibition must be included. The significance of the data is not analysed by correct statistical procedures	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The authors do not follow a particular referencing pattern as per the directions of the journal, it should be rectified.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	NO	
Optional/General comments	NIL The authentication of the plant should be accompanied by herbarium specimen number and authentication letter number	

Commented [MD1]: 'In' not required

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:	Madhu C Divakar
Department, University & Country	The Tamilnadu Dr.MGR Medical University, India