

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

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Sun, Jun 1, 2014 at 3:54 AM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: RE: Request for final decision for manuscript number 2014_BMRJ_11066

This study is interesting, but the experimental designation is not stringent. The main problems in this study are:

1. In several cases, the experiments are not quantitatively performed, such as the plasmid concentration, the cell numbers of competent cells, the efficiency of transformation for transformation.
2. In all the inhibition tests, replicates should be included and statistic analysis is necessary, that has been asked by a reviewer, but was not considered in the reversion.
3. In methods, citation of reference is completely absent and detailed information is needed in almost all the analyses.
4. After I read the whole manuscript, I did not know how many isolates or strains for each bacterial species were used and how these bacteria were obtained and identified.
5. Many of the comments of reviewers were not considered in the reversion, and these comments are reasonable and import for improving the manuscript.

Based upon these observations, I decided to reject this manuscript. However, I would like to give my suggestions to the authors for making a better study on the basis of this work.

Following are some specific comments, and the manuscript with my corrections and comments are attached.

The first time to present an abbreviation, the complete name should be given.

Check through the text and correct *K. pneumonia* to *K. pneumoniae*.

Detailed information is absent for spice sampling. The name of spice, scientific name of the corresponded plant, trade mark and producer should be given.

Detailed information is absent for bacterial collection and identification in methods. The source for bacterial isolation, the medium and conditions for isolation, the method and system for identification should be given.

Detailed information should be given in "ANTIMICROBIAL ASSAY BY AGAR WELL DIFFUSION": the gradients or reference of the medium, the depth of the medium in the plates, the size of the plates, the well number in each plate. Furthermore, how many replicates were included for the estimation? How to check the sensitivity? It was not clear why "in few plates the wells were filled...". It is not clear what are mixed in the combination. If you used only two spices, the current sentence is okay. But when more than two spices were used, you have to specify the combination was for all the spice pairs or only for some of them.

For plasmid extraction, a reference for the method should be given. The extracted plasmids should be verified and visualized by electrophoresis!

In the section of transformation, reference for the method and detailed information should be given about: What are the competent cells? Where or how you got them? If they were purchased, you should give the producer. The concentration of the plasmid extracts and reference of LB medium should be given. How to check or verify the transform ants?

The first paragraph in results should be moved to methods.

A paragraph about the bacterial collection and identification should be given, such as the results of IMViC tests.

A paragraph should be added before the Table 1 and Fig. 1 for explain the results and cite the table and figure.

In Table 1, strain code should be presented for each species.

In Fig. 1 and Fig. 3, the title of Y-axis should be added.

In section 3.2, you mentioned "Antimicrobial activity of spices extracted in Phosphate Buffered Saline". However, this was not presented in method section. Furthermore, it is not clear that the spice was extracted with PBS, or the antimicrobial activity was determined in PBS.

In Fig. 10, molecular marker should be included. In addition, the quality of the figure is not good.

The figures 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 can be deleted because all the available data have been presented in the Tables. Only the current Fig. 2 can be maintained as an example of inhibition zone.

All the Tables, except Table 1, can be combined into a single one because all of them presented the inhibition data and each one only contained little information.

Editor's Details:

En Tao Wang

¹Departamento de Microbiología, Escuela Nacional de Ciencias
Biológicas, Instituto Politécnico Nacional, México

²State Key Laboratory of Agrobiotechnology and College of Biological
Sciences, China Agricultural University, Beijing, China (invited professor)

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