



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Microbiology Research Journal</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_10449
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial Activity of Two Brown Algae (<i>Cystoseria compressa</i> and <i>Padina pavonica</i>) Against Methicillin-Resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>
Type of the Article	Short Communication

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1-The correct genus name of the first tested seaweed is "Cystoseira" not "Cystoseria". 2- Only one solvent (ethanol) is mentioned in the materials and methods section, but, two types of extracts as ethanolic and aqueous extracts are presented in the table 1. So, the method of extraction with water must be written in the materials and methods section.	1. Corrected 2. corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It seems that one word (inhibitors or the other word) is omitted in the line 68. ".. the most active inhibitors ?against...".	Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It should be better to use units for the presented data in the table 1.	