

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_99131
Title of the Manuscript:	Inhibitory activity of phyto ligands from Honey and standard drugs against Staphylococcus aureus PBP2a (5M19)
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:

(<https://journalajrb.com/index.php/AJRB/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes - this is important – honey has been used for hundreds of years in wound management empirically yet data has been lacking</p> <p>I suggest they add the works 'potential' as no inhibitory action has been demonstrated</p> <p>Yes however it needs to modify along with rest of the paper to include MIC data/ in vitro inhibitory data comparison as a minimum addition</p> <p>Broadly but there is a critical lack and that is Minimum Inhibitory Concentration comparisons between honey and the cited antibiotics</p> <p>Probably but critically lacking the clinically relevant MIC data comparisons</p> <p>MIC data required with citations</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The paper is relevant, important contribution and the molecular analysis relevant – however in the absence of in vitro MIC (minimal inhibitory concentration) data comparing honey with the antibiotics cited the impact of the paper is reduced to minimal – supportive MIC data would greatly enhance this paper if conducted to appropriate NCCLS breakpoint criteria	

PART 2:

	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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lloyd Reeve-Johnson
Department, University & Country	University of the Sunshine Coast, Australia