



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_BMRJ_17027
Title of the Manuscript:	Activity Guided Fractionation with Antimicrobial Evaluation of <i>Pergularia Tomentosa</i> L. (<i>Asclepiadacea</i>) Whole Plant
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	The article is original and well written, and reports the potential of the species <i>P. tomentosa</i> as antimicrobial. This article is interesting. However, some points need to be improved. The introduction is well written, but I consider that more current references are included in this manuscript. Material and methods, the authors cite the use of DPPH oxidant. I could not see a link to its use as an antimicrobial. Please explain why you used DPPH. What are the reagents used for the methodology of antimicrobial activity? Please cite these reagents. In results and discussion, the authors begin this point with the tables. Please explain the results first and then insert the tables and graphics, it facilitates the readers of manuscripts, increasing the chances of citations of this work.	Corrections effected in the manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		