



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_50349
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of the habitat on marine macroalgae toxicity
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The purpose of this study was to: a- detect the presence of toxicity in marine algae of the Mexican coasts b- relate the presence of this biological activity to the habitat where these organisms develop. These goals are clear and simple but:</p> <p>« Material and methods » part: - This part do not make it possible to answer these two objectives: what is in the material and method part makes it possible to meet the objective (a) only. - The study of the physicochemical characteristics of habitat is not included in this part: the study of this characteristics is essential to be able to relate the variation of toxicity of algae according to the habitat (the description of studied site is incomplete: you only talk about the location of the 10 sites). - The part 2.3. (Extract preparation) is clear and perfect.</p> <p>« Result » part: - Paragraph 1 (line 16-18) : "A change in toxicity level was detected in <i>Caulerpa cupressoides</i>, <i>Acantophora spicifera</i>, <i>Gracilaria cervicornis</i>, <i>Hypnea musciformis</i> and <i>Laurencia obtusa</i> with respect to the date and locality of collection (Table 1)": Your study does not take into consideration the factor "time" >>> You don't talk about sampling over time >>> you don't present result according to time. - A statistical analysis to support your results is recommended (a simple correlation between habitat characteristics and toxicity or biological activities).</p> <p>« Discussion » part: - The English need review (the sentences are long). - Paragraph 3 (line 1 and 3): you discuss variation according to time while in « Results part » the variations as a function of time are not shown. - Paragraph 6 (from line 2 to 4): you have no results that make you able to discuss the possibility of using toxic molecules for the fight against diseases (HIV, cancer etc.)</p> <p>« Conclusion » part The conclusion need major correction.</p> <p>Based on your results you cannot conclude that: - presence/absence of toxicity due to the locality of collection and to the climate date. - The large amount of toxic species can be used in pharmacological research for potential application against HIV</p>	The manuscript has been thoroughly modified
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	