



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_48416
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF SESQUITERPENES IN THE BARK EXTRACTS OF <i>PILIOSTIGMA RETICULATUM</i> (DL.) HOCHST AND <i>CLEISTOPHOLIS PATENS</i> (BENTH.) ENGL & DIELS AND THEIR ANTIBACTERIAL ACTIVITIES ON <i>SHIGELLA DYSENTERIAE</i> AND <i>STREPTOCOCCUS PYOGENES</i> .
Type of the 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	The article presents the proposal to evaluate the bioactivity of the plants <i>P. reticulatum</i> and <i>C. patens</i> and the terpenoids extracted from them. The introduction fully addresses the importance of the selected plants. It is necessary to integrate new references on other studies proving the various bioactivities proposed by these plants.	Thank You for your suggestion. We have included some references that consolidated our assertions on the antibacterial potency of the test plants
Minor REVISION comments	The abstract can be reduced. The selection of microorganisms evaluated in the test of antimicrobial activity is understandable, but it would be great work to insert other species to be analysed.	We have now modified the abstract and many other parts of the manuscript. We have also highlighted corrected portions in yellow fonts
Optional/General comments	The article is well written and well discussed, being able to be published in this journal.	Thank you very much.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	