SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRIMPS_48544**
Title of the Manuscript:	**COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF THE ANTIBACTERIAL EFFECTS OF HONEY WITH STANDARD ANTIBIOTIC ON BACTERIAL ISOLATES FROM WOUND INFECTIONS**
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	**Abstract** **"**No significant difference (P > .05) was observed between the inhibitory zone diameters of the different concentrations of honey when compared with the standard antibiotic ciprofloxacin against all the bacterial isolates**"** **"**The findings also revealed that ciprofloxacin has higher antimicrobial activity than the type of honey used in this study." I think that the two ideas are contrary. Give values of inhibitory zone diameters of ciprofloxacin **Introduction** You write "Several works had been done to determine the antibacterial effects of honey on bacterial isolates from wound infections." Why you do the same the study? Where is the difference between your study and the previously studies on the antibacterial activity of honey? More, what is the problem that your study want resolve. What the aim of your study? I think that the introduction must be rewrite. Give a new orientation to this study. **Materials and Methods** The software SPSS was most used for survey study. In your case the statistica software is most appropriate. **Results and Discussion** **Minimum Inhibitory Concentration** You have tested 5%, 10%, 20%, 50%, 100% concentration, why you found 6.25% for *S. aureus* and 25% for *E. coli* ?	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Coulibaly Wahauwouele Hermann***
Department, University & Country	***University Nangui Abrogoua, Côte d'Ivoire***