



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_67424
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial Activities and Phytochemical Screening of Crude Extracts of Calotropis gigantea (Giant Milk Weed)
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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



[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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The whole paper content needs to be written in standard English (typographical and grammatical corrections), • The abstract should be rewritten (lacks background statements, states incorrect bacterial name as <i>Klebsiella aerogenes</i> and α-haemolysin, needs ranking of the responses of the bacterial species to the plant extract, lacks list of the phytochemicals obtained and the specific phytochemical among the listed responsible for the antibacterial effects, and also lacks conclusion remark), • Evidence of ethical approaches are mandatory while dealing with human experimentations (clinical pathogens), • Geographic coordinates of the sample collection sites are important, • Details of the plant postharvest processing and phytochemical screening of the plant compounds, • Please give reference protocol(s) for the phytochemical screening of the plant extracts • Use of proper language and phrases in the result and discussion sections, • Framing conclusion remarks based on the results presented, and • Updating the old references of the paper. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing redundant statements in the introduction • Proper use of prepositions in the manuscript • Incorporating recent findings into the paper (about the subject matter) • Differentiating between the response and explanatory variable in the study • Indicating the percentage concentration of the ethanol solvent employed 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Line numbers throughout the manuscript, as it improves and ease communication between the authors and the reviewers • Indicating the type of ANOVA (Analysis of variance) employed in the statistical Analysis • Clear understanding on the use of clinical microbes and experimental microbes in microbiological experimentations 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes, evidence of ethical approaches is mandatory while dealing with human experimentations (clinical pathogens). What samples were collected, how processed, how ethically handled (ethical clearance issues) the sampling procedure, and how was the sampling methods?</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Taye Kebede Dadi
Department, University & Country	Madda Walabu University, Ethiopia