



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_21421
Title of the Manuscript:	IN VITRO ANTIBACTERIALACTIVITY OF THE EXTRACTS OF PEPEROMIA PELLUCIDA(L).
Type of the 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	All comments are attached in the body of the manuscript.	All corrections have been made accordingly as suggested.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		But what I don't understand is how the words were joined together in the reviewed word document copy which does not reflect such in my original sent copy. The corrected word document and PDF are hereby attached.