Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_87579**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Isolation, identification and mode of action of partially purified bacteriocins from lactic acid bacteria in fermented cassava grits.**
Type of the Article	Manuscript

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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	Comment on abstract, title, références • Somehow the aim of manuscript is clear, and the study findings are clear • The title is informative • Abstract should not contain anything about materials and methods • The references are relevant to the topic of the manuscript, and I think the author able to find modern references instead of the old once. References were listed and put in inappropriate manner. Introduction • The introduction is clear and covered the topic of the study • Some phrases need reference • More clarification (You should provide a factual background, clearly defined problem, proposed solution) ## Comment on methodology • I think the methods section is reorganized, it was conducted in good way, methods of the study are reliable, Somehow, there is few missing details need to be complete. • Statistical analysis was not used? ## Comments on data and results • The researcher presented the data in an appropriate way, tables and figures are relevant and clearly presented, appropriate unites. Titles, columns, and rows labelled correctly and clearly. • I wonder, why there are no control growth group (Free of PPB) for all the foodborne bacteria to compare it with the inhibited ones counts. ## Comments on discussion and conclusions I think the result needs to be discussed in good manner and more explanation for the obtained results, and the conclusion needs more attention.	
Optional/General comments		

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)***	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Sarmad Ghazi Al-Shawi**
Department, University & Country	**Basrah University, Iraq**