



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_51120
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial Activity of Fermenting Unripe Pawpaw Parts (<i>Carica papaya</i>) against some enteric bacteria
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>)

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	<p>The title should specify the part of <i>Carica papaya</i> that were used, for example "Antibacterial Activity of Fermenting leaves and Unripe Pawpaw fruit (<i>Carica papaya</i>) against some enteric bacteria" since the leaves do not ripen.</p> <p>Fungal agar and antifungal assay is described and yet the organisms used were all bacterial</p> <p>The antibiotic sensitivity tests do not specify the antibiotics in the procedures and only gives results for two. Besides, these tests were performed separately without the plant extracts and yet the results are compared in the conclusions and recommendations. The differences in inhibition zones may be due to non uniformity of test conditions such as unequal concentrations of the test organisms in each preparation.</p> <p>Some statements are not supported by citations to acknowledge their source, for example the first four statements in the introduction section need citations but they are lacking.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>If the document was not in pdf format, the reviewer would have pointed out the manuscript deficiencies in more detail and assisted to edit some if it was in word format.</p>	

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>The test organisms used are from human origin and no evidence of ethical clearance is indicated.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Moses Mwajar Ngeiywa</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Eldoret, Kenya</i>