



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_24104
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial and Phytochemical Activity of Gliricidia sepium Against Poultry Pathogens
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In : 2. Material and methods 2.1. Collection and identification of the plant material: what are the criteria for identification of this plant used by Mr hassan? In. 2.2 Preparation of the Treatment Samples: Reference of grinding machine (laboratory and country of made). In. 2.2. Preparation of the Treatment Samples: The technique of extraction according to whom, reference of protocol of extraction? In. 2.3. Test Organisms Organisms are provided not collected because they are reference strains. In. 2.4. Standardization of Inoculum The density of suspension inoculated onto the media for susceptibility test was determined by comparison with 0.5 McFarland standard of Barium chloride solution; why you have not used directly Densimeter machine?? In. 2.6.1. Determination of Total Phenol : The spectrophotometer reference not mentioned (model, laboratory and country of made)? In methodology the chlorophorm is not mentioned And in table 1, 2 and 3 Then it is mentioned in table 4 Why?? Response/Ans. <u>There is no where I mention chlorophorm in this study please check all the tables</u> In. 2.5. Reconstitution of Extracts IW = Initial weight of extracts, WA weight of extracts recovered after extraction.and IN Result table 1 what are OW and EW what is the difference between (IW and OW, WA and EW)???? Response/Ans. <u>IW = Initial weight of the extract , WA= weight of extract after extraction</u> In. Discussion You say that Differences were noticed in the antibacterial activities of the crude and fractions	2.1 The information as regard to criteria was not provided by Mr Hassan 2.2 Akharaiyi et al 2012 2.3 ok 2.4 I used the available and understood method. I have assess to Densimeter machine 2.6.1



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of the considered plants extracts. But there is no comparison between the antimicrobial effect of crude extract and leaf extract can you explain it.?? Response/Ans. looking at the table presented you will discover that both crude extract and the fraction were used on the same poultry pathogens that one automatically show their comparison base on their effect on those pathogens In Reference : nombre 6 is wrong Alakomi HL, Skytta E, Saarela M, Mattila-Sandholm T, Latva-Kala K. and Bao JY, Anthocyanins, Flavonoid and Free Radical Scavenging Activity of thines Baybery (Myrial rubia). extracts and their colour properties and stability. Journal of Agric Food Chem. 2005;53: 2327-2332.; Ok thanks The valid is : Jinsong Bao ,^{*,**} Yizhong Cai ,[§] Mei Sun ,[‡] Guoyun Wang ,[!] and Harold Corke [§] Institute of Nuclear Agricultural Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hua Jiachi Campus, Hangzhou 310029, People's Republic of China; Departments of Zoology and Botany, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, People's Republic of China; and Yuyao Agricultural and Forestry Bureau, Yuyao 315400, Zhejiang, People's Republic of China <i>J. Agric. Food Chem.</i>, 2005, 53 (6), pp 2327–2332 DOI: 10.1021/jf048312z Publication Date (Web): February 17, 2005 Copyright © 2005 American Chemical Society Then number 15 the total number of pages of the book are not mentioned ? Please check all references	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 87: Initial weight of extracts, IW added W corrected Line 103 ,104: Please reformulate the sentence corrected Line 111: using [7]. method. Using method (7). <u>Ans.</u> corrected Line 195: 7..66% correct 7.66% Line 366: Creening correct screening added S <u>Ans.</u> corrected Conclusion: Your conclusion is very short and don't- summarize your work you should developed it	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Your work is very interesting he talks about the effects of the extract of the plant Gliricidia septum on avian pathogenic bacteria, you have many results, a characterization of these bioactive molecules will be ideal knowing that this plant is very rich in petroleum derived like coumarin. just you have to recheck references and improve your English. Res/Ans. Thanks	