



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_27009
Title of the Manuscript:	Quorum Sensing Inhibitors: The Novel Bacterial Infection Disrupting Agents
Type of the Article	Review paper

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In this contribution, the author review and synthesizes recent findings related to the relevant and timely subject of QSI. Overall this is a good quality and up-to-date review manuscript of interest for experts in the field. However, IMHO, the authors should more explicitly address the crucial importance of : i) Quorum sensing inhibitors: how strong is the evidence? [see Trends in Microbiology (2013) 21:619] ii) Languages and dialects in bacterial communication beyond homoserine lactones [see Trends in Microbiology (2015) 23:521] iii) Inter kingdom signalling: chemical language between bacteria and host [see Current Opinion in Microbiology (2009) 12:192; Annu Rev Phytopathol. (2013) 51:17; Trends Plant Sci. (2013) 18:167; Trends Plant Sci. (2016) 21:187].	Dear reviewer, I go through these fruit full articles, we are moving in the same direction In regard for the 1st suggested article " Quorum sensing inhibitors: how strong is the evidence? The author of the article thought that the researchers are biased toward QSI substances based on their result in this field. IMHO we are not biased we are based in strong research evidence based in our result that ensure the importance of such alternative strategies to antibiotics. Accordingly, we did not use the ideas of this article The typing mistakes was corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and iv) structural aspects of QS inhibition: potential for structure-based discovery/design of QS AHL mimetics There are few mistyping errors: see p20. "Elastease"	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		