



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_3698
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacterial endophytes of the medicinal herb Hygrophila spinosa T. Anders and their antimicrobial activity

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The aim of the study and conclusion is not matching. Conclusion should reflect the aim/objective of the study. 2. MS contains some grammatical mistakes that need to be fixed. 3. State the authority of the plant at first time only. 4. For the identification of bacteria, 16S rDNA based method is considered as a Gold standard. Author can look into possibility to sequence 16S rDNA to verify the identity of the isolates and their diversity analysis 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Use of appropriate terminology/words	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Subhash J. Bhore
Department, University & Country	Department of Biotechnology, AIMST University, Malaysia