



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	• Careful editing of the syntax and the overall use of the English language • Restructuring of the manuscript so as to pinpoint the antimicrobial activity analysis. Specific comments • Introduction: Although the scope is clear, why did the authors decide to work with this plant? No comment is made to either this plant, its possible use in traditional medicine its possible antimicrobial properties or the bacterial pathogens of poultry for which antibiotic treatment seems to be problematic. Still the authors should give a reason for performing the phytochemical analysis too. As a reader I find it a topic of a different paper, especially in the way it is presented. • P. 2, lines 35 – 37. This sentence seems not relevant. • P. 2, lines 41 – 2. This sentence seems not relevant. • P. 4, lines 71 – 3. No need to write who provided these strains since ATCC strains were used. • P. 4, lines 74 – 5. Are these strains of poultry origin? If not then the authors should consider removing the term poultry pathogens from the title. Otherwise please justify the strain selection. • P. 8, lines 157-8. A short description of the fractionation procedure is needed. Also the percentage of the matter eluted in each fraction would be of interest. • P. 10, lines 205-7. The extent of the zone of inhibition is not correlated with the potency of the extract. Perhaps the authors can make such a statement for the MIC's but certainly not for the disc diffusion data. • P. 10, tables 1 and 2. The tables should be more descriptive. For example there is not need to give abbreviations of the solvents when the full name is of almost the same extent.	1. The reviewer gave a good suggestion that I will help in the subsequent publication in this journal and the others. But I want to tell the reviewer that there is nothing like plagiarism is only that we are in the same school and department so the methodology may be similar p2. when writing an article the may write what seem relevant to the work. We wrote not offhand but looking at the previous work done by different authors. P4 they are of poultry origing P8 any one that need short description can easily summarized. P10 ok P10 : there is no any abrivation in the the tables.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• P. 17, lines 294 – 7. As already mentioned differences in the extent of the zone do not necessarily imply differences in the potency. Furthermore the authors should discuss the importance of the cell wall in the antibiotic susceptibility of the strain (and therefore the Gram reaction). • Discussion – References: This part should be enriched and discussed by the other references citing antimicrobial activity of this plant. The authors could focus on the different origin of the plants since geographical differences have been shown to promote different susceptibility patterns. In a simple Scopus search two more references show up which deal with the antimicrobial properties of this plant. Nazli, R., Akhter, M., Ambreen, S., Solangi, A. H., & Sultana, N. (2008). Insecticidal, nematocidal and antibacterial activities of <i>gliricidia sepium</i>. <i>Pakistan Journal of Botany</i>, 40(6), 2625-2629. REDDY, L. J., & JOSE, B. (2010). Chemical composition and antibacterial activity of the volatile oil from the bark of <i>gliricidia sepium</i>. <i>International Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences</i>, 2(3), 177-179. Perhaps the authors should consider discussing their results. The manuscript has methodological similarities with a paper published by a scientific team based on Nigeria. Akharaiyi, F. C., Boboye, B., & Adetuyi, F. C. (2012). Antibacterial, phytochemical and antioxidant activities of the leaf extracts of <i>Gliricidia sepium</i> and <i>Spathodea campanulata</i>. <i>World Applied Sciences Journal</i>, 16(4), 523-530. On the other hand there are differences in the results reported and therefore I do not think there are any doubts of plagiarism.	P17 ok Discussion ok
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		