



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>Line 107-109: The authors need to mention the amount of plant material and the solvent used in the extraction process. The way the extraction was carried out should be described in detail. The source of solvents used should also be mentioned (e.g., Merck, Darmsdat, Germany), and the number of replicates extracted. The age of the plants used should be mentioned. In the case of leaves; all of them were used or just the young ones. It would be important to know the optimal age of the plant that should result in better potency.</p> <p>Line 117: The specific solvent used needs to be mentioned. The word "suitable" is rather vague.</p> <p>Line 120: Incubator set at what temperature?</p> <p>Line 111-112: The choice of two strains should be justified</p> <p>Line 120-121: How were the inocula prepared? Age of inocula? How was the concentration adjusted to 8 Log CFU/ml?</p> <p>Line 122: type of agar used should be mentioned, as well as the source</p> <p>Line 127: Data on what?</p> <p>Line 127-129: What is the justification for the choice of ANOVA? Was a normality test carried out to show that the data was normally distributed? Otherwise, the authors should consider using non-parametric test. If ANOVA test showed that concentration had an effect, how were the means separated? Was comparison made between roots and leaves extract? Was comparison made</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>between solvents? Line 134-36: there is no statistical analysis done to compare the effect of solvent! Results presented in Tables 1,2 3 and 4 should be made statistically relevant, indicating which means are significantly different, in the current form, the results are less informative, meaningful conclusions cannot be drawn</p> <p>Figures 1 -4 should be accompanied with error bars, and consistent with what is mentioned in the statistical section of the paper</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 121:please consider replacing the word “toxicity”	
Optional/General comments	The article is brief, but informative. It would have been much better if the authors went ahead to identify and quantify the relative concentrations of the active components of the extracts	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Duncan Ongeng, PhD
Department, University & Country	Faculty of Agriculture and Environment, Gulu University, Uganda