SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Microbiology Research Journal International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_MRJI_46440**
Title of the Manuscript:	**In vitro evaluation of the antibacterial activities of Zea mays' stigma and Carica papaya seeds hydro-ethanolic extracts**
Type of the Article	**Short 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	**1. The language of the article is not good. Many portions are not clear to understand due to that reason.** **2. Research design was not good.** **3. Phytochemical extraction was performed without intermittent shaking. It is not the ongoing process.** **4. The researcher did not perform widely used disc diffusion test to know the antimicrobial efficacy of the extracts.** **5. Minimum inhibitory concentration determination procedure is not discussed properly.** **6. Modification at the discussion part is required. Reference of some articles are added for better understanding.**	Corrected
Minor REVISION comments	The final article may be checked by a person having capability to write good English.	
Optional/General comments	The article is not directly written in English language, may be mechanically converted to English from other language. It is always better to write article in the same language as the language of the targeted journal. If some words of the track changes become adhered each other due to that reason, the author have to separate them.	

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)*	