



SDI Review Form 1.6

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY <xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Sat, Aug 24, 2013 at 2:01 PM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: RE: Request for final decision for manuscript number 2013_BMRJ_5623

Please, see the attached two files of my comments and suggestions. This manuscript could be published after the authors make the changes as included.

Editor's Details: Anonymous Editor

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide the email id.

Attached Part:

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



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Major</u> REVISION comments	<p>This is a paper testing the antibacterial activity of <i>Ginkgo biloba sarcotestas</i>-derived compounds.</p> <p>I. Abstract: needs to be rewritten to include important info. Use chloroform extract instead of the chemical formula only.</p> <p>II. Introduction: p.2 . Line 45-46. The authors didn't explain that "sarcotesta" is the fleshy seed coat of the plant where the extract was obtained . The active constituents they mentioned are from the plant leaves and antibacterial activity has been studies on several bacterial species including <i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>, <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>, <i>E. coli</i>, <i>Lactobasillus</i> spp. Etc... as the work done in University van Petroia (http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/submitted/etd-10062010-204510/unrestricted/03chapter3-</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>4.pdf)</p> <p>Authors need to compare to more studies that tested the seed extract in addition to those who used leaves, because different parts might have different constituents.</p> <p>III. Methods: P 3. lines 66-69. Authors included <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> and <i>vibrio mediterranei</i> (a halophilic sp.) in their experiments and yet in the results Table 1, they wrote “not determined”? If inhibition zone was not measured, then the two species should be deleted from the methods.</p> <p>IV. Results: It is preferred to use the term “extracts” instead of “compounds” since what has been tested is the crude extracts that is not defined. p. 6. line 168-169: the statement “mixture 5-7 was slightly more active than 8-10 against all strains tested” is not accurate. The difference in the diameter of inhibition zone is insignificant especially for <i>Staph. aureus</i>, <i>Salmonella enterica</i> <i>Shigella dysenteriae</i>. p. 4. line 106. It was not mentioned how the mixtures were applied as a spot to the TSA plates. If they used a dropper not a micropipette to apply exact equal volumes, then variation in</p>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>volumes applied is expected.</p> <p>p.6. lines 185-186. The statement is not clear.</p> <p>P 7. Fig 2. Optical density should be explained. what does a high or low OD mean in terms of inhibition,</p> <p>p. 8. Figure 3. the Pen/Strep should be written in full.</p> <p>Conclusions: Just because these crude extracts are from plants and have <i>in vitro</i> activity doesn't mean they could be applied in human's food. Other research including cytotoxicity assays of various concentration and other tests still to be done before concluding on their potential use as antibacterial.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		