

Editorial Comments:

This is my advice:

1. Many grammatical errors are pointed out in the second manuscript. I can understand that the experimental data logically supports the conclusion: the antimicrobial activity of AIAH-10 extracted from the mangrove forest. But, the enthusiasm to understand this conclusion can be disturbed by such trivial grammatical errors.
2. Line 21, the author abruptly points out that "Usually, gram negative bacteria is more resistant than positive", but it must be discussed in the design of the EXPERIMENT, not in the INTRODUCTION.
3. The author points out that "to the best knowledge of the author, no work has been carried out against ciprofloxacin and azithromycin resistant E. coli." In the final part of the discussion. This point can give strong motivation to the reader if it is discussed earlier in the INTRODUCTION.
4. Figure 1 should be better presented without deformation. Width is 50% shorter.
5. Reader might be interested if this strain shows and how much antibiotic activity for drug resistant Staphylococcus aureus, even if it is more popular experiment.

Author's Feedback:

1. **All grammatical errors indicated (Red color) by reviewers are corrected in third revised manuscript which was sent to the editorial office.**
2. **We think the point** "Usually, gram negative bacteria are more resistant than positive....." is not actually related to this section and it was deleted from the introductory section.
3. **Our research boss thinks that** "..... no work has been carried out against ciprofloxacin and azithromycin resistant E. coli" is appropriate for discussion section. So it was not discussed in introduction.
4. **As whole manuscript is rearranged during editorial process according to their own format, so figure 1 can be represent at any form to do look better.**
5. **For your kind concern, we are pleased to inform you that this work is carrying on which will be published in near future. Thanking you very much for your kind cooperation and assistance.**