

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_74354
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial activity of propolis against Streptococcus mutans compare with chlorhexidine
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>The title: The title is suitable for the investigation;</p> <p>Abstract: it contains the main contents related to the study;</p> <p>Introduction: Gives an overview of previous publications about the effect of propolis as an antimicrobial substance, mainly against bacteria;</p> <p>Objective: This study aimed to evaluate the antimicrobial activity of Apis bee propolis against the bacteria Streptococcus mutans and Lactobacilli;</p> <p>Methodology: The methodology employing in vitro culture medium in Petri dishes is adequate;</p> <p>Results analysis and discussion: The study carried out shows that several studies are proving the antimicrobial effect of propolis for several bacteria, its therapeutic potential in human medicine being recognized, which shows that the present study has merit;</p> <p>Conclusions: The study showed the effectiveness of propolis as an antimicrobial substance in inhibiting the bacterium Streptococcus mutans, a pathogen that causes dental caries;</p> <p>Reference: The references are very current, with 92% under 10 years old.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>- The manuscript has merit, as it addresses a topic of great importance to human health and showed the viability of propolis as a substance that can be added to chewing gum and candy, as an alternative in human health for preventing dental caries.</p> <p>However, the authors didn’t mention in the manuscript which species of bee ((Apis mellifera, Apis cerana, Apis dorsata or Apis florea...)), which region and season of the year the propolis was collected, and which plant species were predominant during the production of the propolis by the bees. This is extremely important because the chemical composition of propolis depends on these variables to have a uniform quality standard.</p> <p>My opinion is that the authors should add this information to improve the quality of the manuscript.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guido Laércio Bragança Castagnino
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Bahia, Brazil