



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	Results needs to write that, No comments on tables , some of paragraph in discussion could move to results part such as The results of the proximate composition of garlic peel are shown on Table 1 above. The result showed that the <i>Allium sativum</i> is very high in carbohydrate (57.3%) with oil content of 2.6.%. The moisture content was 14.5% while the total ash content and the protein content were 1.3% and 14.8% respectively. Plagiarism Issue: Medicinal plants continue to provide valuable therapeutic Mar 26, 2014 "Allium sativum have been documented and valued for their"Oct 24, 2015 "to which the antimicrobial activity of garlic is attributed;" Mar 1, 2010 "which have interesting pharmacological properties and are"Nov 27, 1979 "content varied from 3.4 mg gallic acid equivalents (GAE)/g"Nov 13, 2013 "Gram positive (Staphylococcus aureus) and Gram negative"May 26, 2015	It was also discussed in the discussion, so there is no need moving it to discussion. References were cited.
Minor REVISION comments	-Result in Abstract should be summarized.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-There are some grammatical suggestions in some sentences : Line 69:In recent: <u>years, man</u> Line 77:The <u>antioxidant</u> Line 209: samples Line 272:aqueous extract of garlic <u>was evaluated</u> Line 279:are shown <u>in</u> Line 281:14.5%, <u>while</u> Line 302:<u>garlic, which</u> Line 363:37.2 mg/<u>ml</u> Line 83:dm???????????? -Authors didn't mention to the source and cod of the two bacterial strains - References should check in the text and in the reference list	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	*Good study but, lacks a comments of Tables. *The manuscript contains minor grammar errors and should be correct . *Some parts of the study require to rewritten. The experimental apparatus is quite standard, and is appropriate for the study. *I don't think any additional experiments are necessary to validate the results presented here.	Noted.