



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_11882
Title of the Manuscript:	<i>IN VITRO</i> ANTIMICROBIAL EFFECT OF CRUDE TANNINS ISOLATED FROM THE LEAF OF <i>ANNONA SENEGALENSIS</i>
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 <i>(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)</i>
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Title: Change '...leaf of Annona...' to '...Leaves of Annona...' 2. Abstract • The abstract was not structured. Kindly check journal website for guideline for writing manuscript. 3. Introduction • The journal also requires the use of Vancouver referencing not Havard method as used in this work. 4. Method • State the month and year of collection of the plant as this may affect the constituents of a plant. • Also state the name of the taxonomist who identified the plant. • Were the test organisms standard or clinical isolates? If standard isolates were used, specify the reference number of the isolates. • Line 89: the size of the wells made on the nutrient agar should be specified. Instrument used for creating the well should also be stated. • Line 103: The authors specified that the range of different concentration used was between 6.25 and 12.5mg/ml. On the contrary table 3 shows that the range was between 1.5 to 50 mg/ml. Harmonize these two ranges. • Line 105/106: Final concentration of cell per ml was not specified. • The antimicrobial activity testing utilized extracts of the leaves and not only tannin extracts. The entire antimicrobial activity can therefore not be attributed to tannin since component like anthraquinone also has antimicrobial activity according to the discussion. 5. Discussion • Discuss the difference in the antimicrobial activity of your tannin and ciprofloxacin which you have used as control. You just mentioned ciprofloxacin in your discussion without discussing the result obtained. • Discussion well compared with some studies but authors should mention briefly what the result obtained from other studies were. For example line 204/205: what was the percentage of tannin obtained by Simon (1993); line 231/232: what values did Nishi (1983) and Banso (2007) get in their works that make them in agreement with the present work?	All the observations made were addressed. The antimicrobial activity is based on the isolated crude tannins from the leaf of the plant not the extract of the leaf. Suggested referencing method was used.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Some previous works have been carried out on other parts of the plants, for example, roots. The work will be richer if you can compare your result with other similar works carried out on other parts of the plant. For example, quantity of tannin in the leaves compared with other parts and its antimicrobial activity. - Your conclusion should be a separate heading and not merged with your discussion. 6. Reference - Apply Vancouver referencing method.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 75: should read ‘...and was shaken every 5 minutes...’	Correction effected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		