



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_56974
Title of the Manuscript:	"Antibacterial Effects of Oregano Essential Oil and its potential Applications".
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	The work is relevant and it was well done	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Please: Define all acronyms before use it, for instance "Essential oils (EO) in addition to having aromatic properties they also have outstanding therapeutic", "Oregano EO (OEO) have been", "and a melted BHI" and so on. Therefore, in this sentence "<i>Origanum vulgare</i> EO on most frequent bacterial intrahospital pathogens: MRSA, MRSE comparatively to selected ATCC bacterial reference strains" – scientific name was used without previous information and disregarding former acronym [Oregano EO (OEO)], MRSA, MRSE and ATCC – will be defined later, i.e., the reader cannot easily understand the meaning</p> <p>Review the phrase: "The oregano EO consisted mainly of oxygenated monoterpenes (20%); corresponded to the phenol compounds: carvacrol and thymol (80%) as the main components" – It seems unclear to me.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Suggestion: comments on Table 1 would be welcome</p> <p>"They are few essential oils that have been used in medicine" – or there are ? "where they are many bacterial pathogens" – or there are ? "was inoculated in a tube containing undiluted and serial 4 serial dilutions" "Undiluted and serial dilutions (1:10, 1:100, 1:200 and 1:400) were shown no bacterial growth at all (Table 1)." – table 2</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Maria Lúcia Pereira da Silva</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of São Paulo, Brazil</i>