



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_10772
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIBIOTIC SUSCEPTIBILITY AND INTESTINAL EPITHELIAL CELL ADHESION PATTERN OF HOMOFERMENTING LACTIC ACID BACTERIA (LAB) ISOLATED FROM KUNU-ZAKI, A SPONTANEOUSLY FERMENTING NIGERIAN CEREAL BEVERAGE

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Though authors have corrected the MS, still there are a few errors and should strictly be removed before publishing the manuscript: 1. Page 19, line 454- page nos not written. 2. Page 7, line 185- reference of Bezares et al. [27] is given, but not mentioned in citation list. 3. Authors should read the 'Authors guidelines' of the journal to write the Results & Discussion part and should write accordingly. For ease of authors the same is given below. The guidelines should not be bypassed in any case. Results & Discussion (From Home page of BMRJ) Results should be clearly described in a concise manner. Results for different parameters should be described under subheadings or in separate paragraph. Table or figure numbers should be mentioned in parentheses for better understanding. The discussion should not repeat the results, but provide detailed interpretation of data. This should interpret the significance of the findings of the work. Citations should be given in support of the findings. The results and discussion part can also be described as separate, if appropriate.	1. Page 19, line 454- Authors cannot find 2. Page 7, line 185-Authors cannot find. Please see No 16 in References for adequate citation of Rojo-Bezares et al 3. Authors have chosen to describe results for different parameters in separate paragraphs. Results and Discussion are described together since one of the previous reviewers commented that Results and Discussion in this work should be merged and authors decided to do so. Tables and figures have been put into parenthesis. Our Discussion provides detailed interpretation and citations are given to support findings.

Its surprising authors were not able to find the lines defined above. They should refer '2.Revised Paper BMRJ_10772' for details. Authors did not find initially because Page 19 line 454 as evaluated was actually Page 19 line 446 in Revised Paper BMRJ 10772_V8 sent to Authors. Page 7 line 185 was Page 7 line 217 in revised Paper BMRJ 10772_V2. Authors therefore were unable to find exactly what the correction was. However **BOTH** had already been corrected in the Version 2 we sent back even without locating it specifically.

Authors have already revised the results and discussion accordingly and improved on MS presentation.

Since authors are not ready to improve the MS as per the reviewers comments and journals guide lines, MS should be rejected.