SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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 biloba sarcotestas 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	The intent of the manuscript is laudable. However, additional detailed information is required on (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. 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.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Detailed comments	*Materials and Method* 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. 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: (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 *et al.,* (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? 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. The tremendous interest in the last 10 years in the extraction and purification and identification of GB 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. 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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Afolabi F. Eleyinmi**
Department, University & Country	**Human Resources and Skills Development Canada (Service Canada)**