



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_38516
Title of the Manuscript:	Anti-Coccidiosis Potential of Heat Antimicrobial Peptides from Xenorhabdus budapestensis Resistant to Proteolytic (Pepsin, Trypsin) Digestion based on in vitro studies
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objective of the study is not clear Study design unclear- priority can give to the methods rather than persons. EMC liquid cultures and obtained sterile CFCEM and tested in all but 11 LH isolates(All but 11 LH not understandable) Methodology should be mention the methods employed in the present study. [2] (Gruenheid et al., 2012) the journal format not followed. No need to mention the author et.al number is enough. The output of the work is really appreciated but the results were presented very poor. Need to present it proper way. <p>Plagiarism Issue-</p> <p>11 % found by using turnitin plagiarism software.</p>	<p>Many thanks for the thoughtful review and corrections.</p> <p>I accept them all.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I re-wrote the Objective and hope that I hope is clear now. I re-wrote the Study design and followed you propositions concerning what I had supposed to transfer to methods. I think I managed to correct what you had criticized, I transferred the suggested sentences to the methods employed in the study. I re-wrote the References following the journal format. Except for a few cases where I felt the mentioning the names would be justified, I removed all the names et al. and left the numbers instead. Many thanks for this remark. Many thanks for your appreciation of the output, and I admit that the presentation of the results must have been much better. I hope my corrections, especially in the Discussion and the Conclusion means some improvement. I downloaded and used Grammar software and hope that the plagiarism issue improved somewhat. I also removed the internet sources. <p>Also I tried to correct the part what TURNITIN PLAGARISM SOFTWARE revealed, and the silly mistake in the title.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Line 212 to 228, mention about the center from where the isolates were collected is enough. No need to mention the names of all the professors who helped to get the strains. If author interested can mention about their support at acknowledgment. Avoid lot of citations at discussion which may impact on the novelty of the work. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I re-wrote the (originally) 212 – 228 lines following your kind instructions. Now they are lines 221 - 236. I drastically reduce the number of citations at discussion
Optional/General comments		