



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	Materials and methods: This part is not clearly written and methods are non repeatable in many places. Examples: 1- lines 65- 67: extract preparation. 2- lines 80, 93, 108: the used equipment should be written (brand, model, country.etc.) 3- lines 130- 132: the prepared solution should be on molar bases. 4- Collection and identification of plant material should be based on the literature or a known herbarium (persons names should be mentioned in an acknowledgement). Other comments: 1- Titles of materials and results should be of the same arrangement as they appear in the manuscript. 2- language should be revised and corrected by an expert as there are many mistakes and inappropriate structure in many parts (e.g.: the very long sentence in lines 280- 283). 3- Discussion should be shortened avoiding the repeated words or paragraphs as in the final parts of abstract and discussion. 4- What was meant by "antinutrient content"??? 5- There were no obvious explanation for the relation between antioxidants and antibacterial content and its effects on the used bacteria. The authors should focus on this in the discussion or the antioxidant part should be omitted.	
Minor REVISION comments	1-The used equipments should be clearly stated including Brand names, models and country. 2- the used references should not be indicated in the text as a method but a method provider (e. g. lines 52, 111). 3- Some methods were not accompanied with reference (see det. of ferric reducing property in which the equipment used was not also mentioned). 4- In the reference section: reference no. 2 is incomplete (no journal , vol., year or pages).	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1- Many parts need to be re-written in correct language (e. g. lines 294- 297 indicating that the tested bacteria have antibacterial effect????). Generally, language can be revised and corrected by one of those available services produced by publishers on the internet. 2- The discussion should be re-written to clearly indicate the relations between the analyzed plant constituent, the used bacterial strains and the obtained results.	
--	--	--

Reviewer Details:

<u>Name:</u>	<i>Wael F. Sayed</i>
<u>Department, University & Country</u>	<i>Faculty of science, South Valley University, Egypt</i>