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I would just like to add a comment as a note of credit for deciding to investigate, among other things, the antibacterial activity of seed extracts, which, unlike essential oils, are usually less investigated, but which have remarkable biological properties.
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| **Methodology** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | A | Demonstrates clear understanding and proper use of methodology, identifies relevant strengths and weaknesses of methods used. | | B | Demonstrates proficient knowledge of methodology and gives justification for selection of methods. | | C | The methodology is not well appropriate for study and understanding is not clearly demonstrated. | |
| **Analysis/**  **Presentation of Results** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | A | Results interpreted in light of proposed research question and existing literature. Includes alternative explanations and instructional tables and graphs. | | B | Results clearly summarized, discussion of results focused and tied to research question. | | C | Presentation lacks focus, tables are unorganized, and results produce no insight into proposed question. | |
| **Discussion/ Implications** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | A | Clearly summarizes the key information gained from the study and describes advancement of knowledge or new insights on an issue. | | B | Discussion of results focused and connected to research questions. Implications for future research discussed. | | C | The new knowledge gained from the study and implications of the study are not clearly discussed. | |
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