



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_5623
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial activity of phenolic compounds derived from Ginkgo bilobasarcotestas against food-borne pathogens
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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	<p>The intent of the manuscript is laudable. However, additional detailed information is required on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the methodology employed in the preparation, extraction and characterization of the extracts. (ii) results for controls used in the work as a basis for comparison. <p>The validity of findings in this work depends, to a large extent, on scientifically establishing the identity, chemical composition and structure of the isolates from the plant material reported on.</p>	<p>GENERAL COMMENTS</p> <p>We thank the Reviewer for the very careful reading of our manuscript and for the precious comments which will help us to increase clarity of our work.</p> <p>Our article is essentially directed to a public of microbiologists; therefore, following Reviewer's advices, we better detailed methods and controls referring to the microbiological assays (see specific comments below).</p> <p>We also agree on the importance of the identity, chemical composition and structure of Ginkgo compounds. However, the tested compounds have been isolated and largely characterized by one of the authors of the present work (Jinwoong Kim) in previous works. We understand and agree with the need suggested by the Reviewer to better stress this point in the revised text (see specific comments below), although we clearly specify that these data and methods have been already published elsewhere [ref 18].</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
<p>Detailed comments</p>	<p><u>Materials and Method</u></p> <p>1. The authors provided detailed information on the bacterial strain and media (source, strain etc) but did not provide corresponding details on the source of the plant extracts used in the antibacterial testing.</p> <p>Referencing is acceptable in the materials and methods section where the author is using the same methodology as previously described. This appears to be the case here. Simply providing this reference, in relation to the objective of this work, did not address the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) what is the source of the GB used? (ii) how did you confirm that what you worked with was GB? (iii) how was the extract prepared? Exactly as described by Lee <i>et al.</i>, (1998)? (iv) how did you confirm that the extracts/compounds obtained in this work are exactly the same as those reported by Lee et al (1998)? (v) how did you positively confirm that the structural properties of the extracts? <p>The chemical analysis and quality control of GB has been comprehensively reviewed. Since 2001, over 3,000 papers on GB have been published, with about 400 devoted to chemical analysis, isolation and characterization of active ingredients.</p> <p>The tremendous interest in the last 10 years in the extraction and purification and identification of GB</p>	<p>1. See new text added in the revised version starting from line 84. Your queries, from (i) to (v) have a simply and cumulative answer: the compounds microbiologically tested by the Italian group (Carraturo, Raieta, Tedesco, Russo) have been provided by the Korean co-author, Jinwoong Kim, who prepared and characterized them exactly as reported in reference [18].</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>extracts using combination of procedures involving LC/MS/MS, RP-HPLC with ELSD, GC/FID or GC/MS underscore the need to provide information on how the extract was isolated and characterised.</p> <p>2.Controls:The absence of data for the positive and negative controls does not make it easy to conceptualize “the remarkably high inhibitory activity” of the extracts/compounds studied.</p>	<p>2. For the Agar diffusion method (paragraph 2.3), a mixture of the following antibiotics was used as a positive control: Pen/Strep (penicillin 5000 IU/ml; streptomycin 5000 $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ (Life Technologies, Milan, Italy). DMSO and Nutrient broth were employed as negative controls (lines 109-112).</p> <p>For the broth microdilution method (paragraph 2.4), the European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST) protocol was used (lines 122-124). This method includes positive and negative controls that, for brevity, we omitted in the text, but cited in reference [20].</p> <p>The controls used in the experiment of paragraph 2.5 were medium plus bacterial culture, and medium plus bacterial culture containing 80 μl DMSO (lines 143-145).</p>
--	--	--