



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_50413
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF STAPHYLOCOCCAL ACTIVITY OF GARCINIA KOLA ALMONDS
Type of the 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>)

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>General Revision, however if the revision is poor, the decision is rejection</p> <p>Individual Lines 28,30 S. aureus is in italic.</p> <p>Within Introduction, please clarify what the originality of your study is.</p> <p>Lines 58 to 65, did you validate what the percentage of the yield of water extraction? According to line 162 6.2% b y H2O extraction and this yield will increase with the use of hydrophobic solvent such as MeOH, EtOH, acetone cited Quy et al.</p> <p>Line 160, 200 in vitro is in italic.</p> <p>Table II the extraction of almond with water, if the extraction solvent will be more hydrophobic solvent, the yield will be greater? So why did you study only water extraction cited Quy et al using water, MeOH, EtOH, acetone? According to Line 162 yield was 6.36%, so why did you try to study with different hydrophobic solvents? Is this paper for trace analysis of Yete et al (2015) and Quy et al and Stalikas and Akerele?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:



SDI Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hideharu Shintani
Department, University & Country	Chuo University, Japan