

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_95487
Title of the Manuscript:	PLANTS PHENOLICS AS POTENTIAL INHIBITORS OF PSEUDOMONAS AERUGINOSA RESISTANCE
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<https://www.journalapri.com/index.php/APRJ/editorial-policy>)

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes 2. no 3.no 4.yes 5.yes 6.no -the author(s) focused mainly on the review of Pseudomonas aeruginosa/ Pseudomonas aeruginosa Resistance rather than a review of plants phenolics as potential inhibitors of Pseudomonas aeruginosa Resistance. This is not appropriate -as a solution, the author(s) should empirical check literatures on plants/plants phenolics that have been proven as potential inhibitors of Pseudomonas aeruginosa Resistance. A detailed potential mechanism of action should also be fully discussed. -the review on Pseudomonas aeruginosa/ Pseudomonas aeruginosa Resistance should also be kept minimal to 2-3 pages -please refer to the manuscript for other issues raised	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. The highlighted texts in the manuscript should be cross-checked for English quality and punctuations.	
Optional/General comments	Literature search for this review is poor. From previous study, there are numerous plants/plsnts phenolics that have been proven to be efficient against Pseudomonas aeruginosa, the author(s) should do a thorough literature search. However, the study is of great importance.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayodeji Oluwatobi Ojetunde
Department, University & Country	Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria