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)

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	**Italized 'In vitro , Zea mays and Carica papaya' in the title.** **Recast the abstract to attract readers.** **The words highlighted in yellow were corrected.** **The words highlighted in green are to be verified.** **Remove the sentence in red in the introduction. Avoid redundancy.** **In the results, these concentrations were not seen** 12.5 ml, 6.75 ml and 3.125 ml. Present the full result and thereafter extract the MICs and MCBs. The discussion is not harmonized. The author should work on the discussion to improve the readability of the work. The discussion is vague. Buck of the references in this section is not in accordance to the journals guideline. Stick to the guideline. **The references are not in accordance to the journals' guideline.** **Recast the conclusion. Conclude base on the findings of your study.**	Corrected
	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.**	We corrected
Minor REVISION comments	Give all scientific names in italic. Make clear what is CMB and CIM? Rectify minor errors in sentence formation.	corected
	The final article may be checked by a person having capability to write good English.	
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.
Kindly see the following link:
http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

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)* No ethical issue	