



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_3887
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro antibacterial activity of Cichorium intybus against some pathogenic bacteria

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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript entitled “<i>In vitro</i> antibacterial activity of <i>Cichorium intybus</i> against some pathogenic bacteria” is interesting. However, I have a few major reservations in accepting this manuscript at the present state.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A major hindrance for accepting this manuscript is the statistical model that is irrelevant and I don't see that one way ANOVA is correct-one. Authors are requested to consult a Biostatistician to develop an accurate and appropriate model based on hypothesis. 2. The write-up is very poor and I don't consider it suitable for publication at present stage 3. Manuscript is full of general statements and the information inferred from the results are <i>totally</i> wrong. In few instances, the irrelevant information are written without suitable scientific references. 4. To increase the bulk of the manuscript, figs are incorporated that are repetition as same data is also present in Tables. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

5. The foot-notes of tables are meaningless and I could not find any Posthoc test. No superscripts are present on the values while comparing the results.

Introduction

General Comments

The major portion of introduction seems to be irrelevant. E.g., Information mentioned in Line 72-86 are general one and doest fit in the objectives of the study.

L 88 Please insert “a” between contains and number

L89-90. Plese mention reference. Don’t mention the general statement.

Line 91-92. Sorry I could not find the reference for authenticity. Is it a scientific reference?

L95. What it means “worldwide report”

Line 99. Please mention the names of bacterial species (E coli & Pseudomonas)?

Materials and Methods

General Comments.

The manuscript lacks the clarity for M&M. The experimental design is not fully described as I could not find the incorporation of standard medicine (cefotaxmine) in this chapter. Whether the cefotaxmine was run parallel. How the inhibition zone was determined for this cefotaxmine. I could not find \pm SD for this drug.

How the *C. intybus* was confirmed by a botanist? Plz add reference of Botanist.

As mentioned earlier, the statistical design is not appropriate. I would suggest using Factorial Design with extraction method as an independent variable and dose as factors. The same procedure may be repeated for each (root or stem/leaves). How we can compare the effect of same extraction method between two species.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>What will be outcome if both roots and leaves are analyzed simultaneously for one bacterium. (e.g., 2 (plant part)x 5 (extraction method)x 3 (dose) factorial may be appropriate for comparisons.</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>The inference drawn from the results are quite irrelevant. The comparisons are made with other plants. Most of the statements are general. e.g., L134-135.</p> <p>Similarly, how inferences in Line 137-138 were drawn. It is not rational to conclude on a single data point. There is repetition of Tables and Figs. Plz delete the figs.</p> <p>Line 132-133 Plz delete it</p> <p>Line 134-136. From the table, I cant find this statement correct as no statistical data relating to this information. Same is true in whole body of manuscript where various extraction methods have been compared with each other that are not depicted in Tables</p> <p>Line 139-140. I can not find cefotaxmine incorporation in the M&M. How, the single data point may be compared.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer