



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_8986
Title of the Manuscript:	PARTIAL PURIFICATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF EXTRACELLULAR PROTEASE OF <i>Shigella dysenteriae</i> AND ITS INHIBITION BY THE VOLATILE OIL OF <i>Thaumatococcus danielli</i> Now titled "Assessment of Antibacterial Activity of Essential Oil Extracted From Leaves of <i>Thaumatococcus danielli</i> (Benn.) Benth. In Light of its Inhibitory Impact on Extracellular Protease of <i>Shigella dysenteriae</i> "

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Lines 115-120. When I asked "how were prepared the cultures used in the antibacterial assays" I was not referring to medium preparation. Indeed, the sentence "A colony of each of the organism ($\approx 1.0 \times 10^6$cfu) was incubated at 37°C for 24 hours" is now enough to me. Figure 1. Mistakenly, I had seen the number 250 instead of 750 in Figure 1 from the original version in PDF. The authors are correct and I apologize for the confusion. The explanation that authors do not have financial resources to perform a SDS-PAGE is fair and honest. Since there are no more sentences that refer to a implicit protein homogeneity, I do not see any more problem regarding this aspect.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer