

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_81490
Title of the Manuscript:	Susceptibility of Escherichia coli, Salmonella typhi and Shigella spp to ethanoic extract of Lawsonia inermis
Type of the Article	Original Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalmrji.com/index.php/MRJI/editorial-policy>

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>This paper describes the antimicrobial activity of Lawsonia inermis (Henna) ethanolic leave extract against Salmonella typhi, Shigella spp., and Escherichia coli. However, I note that the extension of the Introduction section is too longer. In addition to that, more explanation about the different types of extracts are needed. The manuscript also looks confuse in some parts (see minor comments). The conclusion was too simple. In my point of view, the paper is an interesting approach and may be acceptable for publication in the future, but it has to be much improved before publication.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract section: Change "Three antibiotics (Gentamicin, Ciprofloxacin and Cefataxime) were used as control for the test organisms respectively" with "Gentamicin, Ciprofloxacin and Cefataxime were used as control antibiotics for the test organisms, respectively." 2. In all document, change "highest (7.25mm) zone of inhibition" with "highest inhibition zone (7.25mm)". 3. In all document, to revise the use of capital letters. 4. In all document, change "F Cal" with "FCal" and change "F Tab" with "FTab". 5. Introduction section: the first sentence is the same than that showed in the abstract section. 6. In all document, unify "health care" or "healthcare" and "Gram-negative" or "gram negative" 7. Define the acronyms the first time it appears (e.g. World Health Organization (WHO)) and then continues used. 8. In all document, rewritten the scientific names of the species using proper form (e.g. Combretum duarteanum). Also, Greek origin word must be written in italic (e.g. in-vitro) 9. Introduction section: this sentence "Both gram positive and gram negative bacteria used for the antibacterial screening of different plant species" is incomplete. 10. In all document, to review the use of punctuation marks. 11. Significance of Study: change "most simplest" with "simplest". 12. Study Area: change "season" with "seasons". 13. Check the wording of the "Sample Collection" subsection. 14. Change "Preparation of Extract" with "Preparation of Extracts" 15. Change "minutes" or "mins" with "min" and change "hrs" with "h". 16. Results and discussion: the first paragraph was previously written in the Introduction session. 17. Results and discussion: this sentence "In table 1, the zones of inhibition upon the application of the ethanoic extracts" is incomplete. 18. Change "ethanoic extract (soaked)" with "soaked ethanoic extract". Apply the same correction for "ethanoic extract (macerated)" and "ethanoic extract (boiled)". 19. The results of tables 1 and 2 are not explained in depth. 20. Change "..., the highest mean zones of inhibition is 25.70mm observed from..." with "..., the highest mean zones of inhibition is are 25.70mm observed from...". 21. This part "But (at p<0.01, F Cal = 4.201, F Tab = 7.591)..." is not understood. 22. Table 1: ¿ why the difference between the values obtained for boiled extract when Shigella as test organisms was used?. 23. The conclusion is not directly connected with the article goal. 24. List each of the recommendations. 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>In my opinion, the work investigates an interesting topic and reports some important results. However, this manuscript may be published after major revision.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Jairo Antonio Cubillos Lobo
Department, University & Country	Pedagogical and Technological University of Colombia, Colombia