



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_21731
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIBACTERIAL PROPERTIES OF SNAIL MUCUS ON BACTERIA ISOLATED FROM PATIENTS WITH WOUND INFECTION
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 manuscript is easy to read and understand. It is clear, but it's necessary Minor Revision, for an example, it's necessary explain more details in the Materials and Methods. The Discussion is very poor.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It's necessary to complete information what software was used and information about its such as frequencies (i.e: Statistic 7.0 (Company name, city, country)).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I think that it's necessary put the sentence: The snails were handled in accordance with the principles of animal welfare in scientific experiments. The results are well explains.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Brazil