



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_19581
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical and Antibacterial Investigation of Leaf Extracts of Vernonia Amygdalina
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	The manuscript provides useful data on antibacterial effects of <i>Vernonia amygdalina</i> leaf extracts. However, a revision of the manuscript is necessary since no statistical evaluation of the data shown in Table 2 is provided. I think that the authors have repeated their experiment at least thrice and that they have not obtained the same data (Zone of inhibition in mm) in each replicate. I therefore recommend the authors to show both the mean values and the statistical differences (SD or SE, and ANOVA, multiple comparisons tests such as LSD 0.05 to indicate significant differences of the different concentrations of bacterial inoculum on bacterial growth inhibition). Further comments: Bacterial names have to be corrected - "<i>Klebsiella pneumonia</i>", and "<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>" - all bacterial scientific names have to be written in <i>italics</i>. "Compositae" plant family (line 31) has to be written with a capital "C" Insert a space between a number and a corresponding unit, e.g., line 60 and further in the text, "5 g", "10 ml", "5 minutes", etc. Minor (formal) comments to the text: Abstract, line 1 and further in the text: Use rather the term "biologically active substances" than "principles" Line 19: Correct the word form in "combined action" (not "combine action") Line 22: Write "new substances or alternatives" Line 39: Remove a comma after the word "extract" in the sentence "Vernonia	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	amygdalina leaf extract was screened...” Line 123: Insert a comma before the word “respectively” Line 150: Insert a comma after the words “In the present study,...” Line 154: Insert “a” before the words “lytic agent”, i.e., “a lytic agent” Line 155: Insert a hyphen “-” between the words “plant-derived” Line 174: Insert a comma after the word “Similarly,...” Line 176: Insert “the” in the sentence “...a basis for the future use...” Line 183: Use rather the term “biologically active substances” than “principles”	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Klara Kosova
Department, University & Country	Crop Research Institute, Prague, Czech Republic