



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_43988
Title of the Manuscript:	IN VITRO COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ANTIBACTERIAL ACTIVITY OF ETHANOLIC LEAF EXTRACTOF EUCALPYTUS citriodora HOOK WITH SELECTED ANTIBIOTIC ON CLINICAL AND TYPED ISOLATES OF Escherichia coli.
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>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the title of the manuscript should be revised to be more innovative and attractive. - Abstract is poorly written and should be revised as follows: background, objectives, methods, results and conclusion. - Introduction: In page 1, from lines 42 to 49, the authors emphasize about the importance of finding therapeutic alternatives to deal with MDR infections, but they don't include any MDR strain in their study, so the introduction should be reformulated or an MDR strain included. - Since the study is focused only against <i>Escherichia coli</i>, the introduction needs more information regarding this bacterium. - Traditional uses of the studied plant against <i>Escherichia coli</i> infection should be provided in the introduction. - please provide the extraction yield of the extract in the methodology section and the formular used to calculate it. - what do you mean by "The crud of ethanolic leaf extract"? - The American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) strain, <i>Escherichia coli</i> ATCC 35218, was used for quality control instead of "typed <i>E. coli</i> isolate", please correct it throughout the manuscript. - can the authors explain how the methods of CLSI (9) was used to compare the inhibitory efficacy of the leaf extracts with commercial antibiotic on both isolates of <i>E. coli</i>? - Please provide the families, manufacturer' name and country of the following antibiotics: "ciprofloxacin, chloramphenicol, amoxicillin, gentamycin, tetracycline and nalidixic acid" as well as disc load of extract and antibiotics. - Please include statistical analysis in figures 1 and 2. Also replace "Typed <i>E. coli</i>" by "reference strain" and "clinical <i>E. coli</i>" by "clinical isolate" - The results and discussion section need to be scientifically presented. Finally, to demonstrate the potential applications of the studied plant extracts as drug sources, activities of extracts need to be compared with other plant extracts which were reported having antibacterial activity. 	<p>-Assesment Of Antibacterial Efficacy of Ethanolic Leaf Extract Of <i>Eucalyptus Citriodora</i> Hook on Clinical and Typed Isolates Of <i>Escherichia coli</i>.</p> <p>-The abstract have been rewritten as instructed. Do you mean spacing for those point highlighted in the abstract ?</p> <p>-The information on MDR and <i>E. coli</i> have been provided and highlighted</p> <p>-Previous studies on the traditional uses of <i>E. citriodora</i> have been provided and highlighted.</p> <p>-The % percentage yield of the extract is provided in the manuscript. I hope that is what you mean ?</p> <p>-Is not crud extract I meant to write, is crude extract.</p> <p>The manufacturer name of those antibiotics is oxoid and made in England. All thier various family name is mention in the manuscript.</p> <p>All data were expressed as mean \pmS.E. One-way analysis of variance was used to analyze data. $P < 0.05$ was considered significant difference between means (Duncan's multiple range test).</p>
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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>	