



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_19142
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIBACTERIAL ACTIVITY OF METHANOLIC EXTRACT OF HIBISCUS SABDARIFFA LEAVES AND FRUITS
Type of the Article	Short Communication

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Lines 2 and 3 Antibacterial Activity of <u>the</u> Methanolic Extract of - add the and this should be single space Lines 6, 7 and 8 The two sentences are the same, it was said in another sentence in the next one. Line 12 In the present is aimed – this can be improved to the present study aimed to carry out the antibacterial properties of <u>the</u> methanolic extract - the was added Lines 13-15 the crude methanolic extract of <i>Hibiscus sabdariffa</i> leaves and fruits showed better antibacterial activity against gram negative bacteria <u>compared</u> to gram positive bacteria - remove than and compare should be past sentence Line 17 the conclusion is a repetition of lines 13 to 15 this can be deleted. Line 21 Keywords should not be all CAPS Line 49 However . . . biological activities reported – remove are Line 55 authenticated by botanist (Fig1) the figure should be placed below not at the end of the article Line 66 The methanoilc extracts obtained – remove as	Agreed with the reviewer comments and corrected in the revised manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	above Line 69 Tests for alkaloids Line 70 1. Dragendorff's test – this should already be numbered as 1 because this is a test for alkaloids Line 71 2. Wagner's test Line 74 3. Mayer's test Line 76 4. Hager's test Line 191 and fruits should better antibacterial activity against gram negative bacteria - remove than <u>compared to</u>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	References in most of the international journals I have Peer Reviewed numbers are used in the citation in the text and references at the end. In this paper no citations were made in the text, which is important	Agreed with the reviewer comments and corrected in the revised manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	A rare plant showed antibacterial property which will contribute to the discovery of possible antibiotics to solve the problem resistance of bacteria to the present antibiotics	