



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_24095
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial and antioxidant activity of aqueous garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i>) extract against <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> and <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>
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 title as written subsumes antioxidant activity of aqueous garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i>) extract against <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> and <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>. Therefore recast. Suggestion: Antimicrobial and antioxidant properties of aqueous garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i>) extract Replace 'Objective' with 'Aim' and recast to reflect the corrected title. were carried out in Biochemistry Laboratory? Delete and state the method(s) used. in the Microbiology Laboratory? Delete and state the method(s) used. Line 15-16: The present study investigate the antimicrobial and antioxidant activity of aqueous garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i>) extract against <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> and <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>.??? Delete. Line 17: ... plant?? Line 19: .. like? Replace with 'including' Line 21: ...0.285 ±0.0226?? Unit? Line 22: 28.74 ± 8.23mg?? Cross check unit. mg or mg/100g? for thegarlic extract with concentrations from 3 to 40 mg/mL and the IC₅₀ value was 25.3 mg/mL	Activity has been changed to properties in the manuscript. The changes have been done. The different methods used in the analyses have been stated. Thanks Done. The word plant has been changed to garlic. I think the word like is more appropriate. Done. Done.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Recast to ...corresponding to concentration range from 3 to 40 mg/mL while the IC₅₀ value was 25.3 mg/mL Line 24: The antibacterial activity of the garlic extract was carried out by agar well diffusion method.?? Repetition of information. See line 12. Line 25: It was characterized by inhibition zones of 25.6 ± 2.4 mm for <i>S. aureus</i> and 28.1 ± 1.8 mm for <i>P. aeruginosa</i>.??? Recast. <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> was tested against 10 standard antimicrobial agents, of these; chloramphenicol, ciprofloxacin, septrin, pefloxacin, streptomycin, gentamicin, amoxacillin, and sparfloxacin were sensitive while augmentin and tarivid were resistant to the tested organism. <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> were susceptible to pefloxacin, amoxacillin, ciprofloxacin, streptomycin, and septrin. Resistance to gentamicin, ampiclox, zinnacef, rocephin and erythromycin were also observed with the same organism. The minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) for <i>P. aeruginosa</i> was 40 mg/ml while <i>S. aureus</i> has a value of 80 mg/ml. ????? Recast or delete. The seeming conclusion in the abstract did not reflect the antioxidant aspect of the study? Line 43-50: Recast to two short sentences. Generally, the introduction as written did not justify the need for this study hence the need to recast the entire introduction section.	Done. This sentence has been recasted. This sentence is ok, please ignore. Please note, all these sentences cannot be deleted because they are the important summary note on the microbial study. I don't think it need adjustment. These sentences are not the conclusion. The overall conclusion is "the extract has strong potency against these microorganisms with <i>P. aeruginosa</i> being the most susceptible". I think the Introduction is ok.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 88-90: recast to reflect the corrected title and aim. Line 92-96: The authenticator is seemingly not a taxonomist??? Line 103-104: delete , 1982 and , 1998 Line 218: All analyses were carried out in triplicate???..... SEM not provided in the proximate result??? 0.285 ± 0.0226 ?? correct to 0.285 ± 0.02 Tables 4 and 5: Not described in the methodology. Describe in the methodology if conducted in this study otherwise provide reference source. Also, reference the basis for the ‘interpretation’. Reference pattern need to be corrected in line with the journal format. The discussion not well coordinated a seeming reflection of a poor study justification and design. The antioxidant aspect of the study not reflected in the conclusion	Done. Yes that’s true. You will also agree with me that garlic is a well known edible bulb of the lily family. Done. The SEM values not necessary because we calculated the average values. Done. Table 4 and 5 methodologies were described. See note on antibiotic susceptibility testing. Noted, please make suggestions. There is no need, since it was not a comprehensive antioxidant assay.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		