



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013 BMRJ 4291
Title of the Manuscript:	Quorum sensing and interspecies interactions in <i>Stenotrophomonas maltophilia</i>
Type of the Article	Review

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 (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	In brief, this review article presents aspects of <i>Stenotrophomonas maltophilia</i> (an opportunistic pathogen), regarding its capability for quorum-sensing cell-cell communication. This mechanisms is ultimately proposed by the author as possible to be used for the control of this bacterium in clinical environments. I have a few concerns to be addressed by the author before accept the article for publication. 1. Since the topic is quite narrow I propose the article to be published as mini-review instead of full-review article. 2. I missed the presence of an informative table (e.g. regarding the most relevant studies in the area and/or any kind of contributions to sustain the topics reviewed in the text). It would be helpful to include an figure illustrating the genetic mechanisms involved in close related strains, as wrote in line 83.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	L122: replace 'we show' by 'they show' L128: rephrase 'here we have provide ...' L131: replace 'our findings indicate' by 'these findings indicate' L139-141: add a reference to support such statement Abstract and L 202: 'attractive' is not a good word. Maybe it could be better to replace by 'required' or 'necessary' or 'it emerges as an feasible option to' etc.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall the article is very good. The text flows in a easy to follow way. Except by a few very basic sections such as S2 and S2.1. I fully understand that such baseline must be placed before get into more details on the mechanisms and how it goes up to the possible use of it in clinical control of <i>S. maltophilia</i>. However, as a reviewer I should also suggest that more details can be incorporated by the author to make these sections more informative to a broad audience. There are several examples available in the current literature.	
---	---	--

Note: Anonymous Reviewer