



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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

PART 2:

a

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>i) I have re-reviewed the paper thoroughly and I have also discussed with a biostatistician. I appreciate your work and originality of the data. The experimental work has been done and explained properly, however the major point of concern for me is statistics. There were different solvents and different doses in each study, i.e. root and leaf, and the factorial analysis looks an appropriate test, not the single way ANOVA. If the author is confident using the single way ANOVA, he/she may kindly provide the justification. There was no post-hoc test to present the difference/significance between two groups.</p> <p>ii) It is also to mention that the present statistical model does not fit the objectives of the study that was to compare both root and leaf variables. The author compared both these parameters in part of 'Discussion', while these parameters were not statistically compared. Both these parameters must be included in the statistics to better explain the Discussion section.</p> <p>iii) The reference treatment Cephotaxime was discussed in the Discussion section however Cephotaxime was not part of statistical analysis. Kindly explain it.</p> <p>iv) I STRONGLY recommend/suggest the author to see a statistician for advice that will improve the interpretation and thus Discussion and help the readers to understand better and make the paper worth-reading.</p>	

b

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The reference treatment Cephotaxime was not mentioned in the MATERIAL AND METHOD section. Kindly explain it. Also explain if it is used as triplicate or not?</p>	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

c

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Line 123-124: Kindly mention the manufacture details of the PAST software used in the study? Line 124: Kindly mention 'the P-value' in the text.	

d

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Figure 1a-b Were these the pooled data of all solvents? If yes, how can we pool the samples when there are significant differences among them? If no, then which solvent data is here?	

e

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Table 2. In the footnote part, the phrase 'the different concentrations ... have significant effect, while acetone extract has highly significant effect ...' is not clear. Kindly explain it.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer