



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/EJMP/2220
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Assessment of Antibacterial and Antifungal Activity of Dried Leaves of <i>Acalyphawilkesiana</i>.

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The authors do many of the corrections but there are some that they don't do, for example:</p> <p>1.- The voucher number is missing.</p> <p>2.-Evaluation of antibacterial activity is only qualitative missing the quantitative part. The authors have to determinate MIC values.</p> <p>3.- In: 2.3.1. Antimicrobial susceptibility test for Bacteria, they write: ...corresponding to 2.0×10^{-6} CFU per ml... and has to say :corresponding to 2.0×10^6 CFU per ml.</p> <p>4.- In: 2.3.2 Antimicrobial susceptibility test for Fungi, they write: ...corresponding to 2.0×10^{-5} spore/ml... and has to say: corresponding to 2.0×10^5 spore/ml.</p> <p>5.- In table 1. they write: <i>S. aureus</i> (ATCC 29213) in the Hexane extract 3.0 ± 0.0, if the wells size is 5 mm how do the authors report 3.00 mm of inhibition zone?</p>	<p>1. Line 80 on page 3 has voucher number included as demanded.</p> <p>2. MIC values were determined on pages 6 and 9.</p> <p>3. Line 131 on page 5 was corrected.</p> <p>4. Line 160 on page 5 was corrected.</p> <p>5. The wells size were 5mm. Measurements began at the edge of the wells to the end of inhibition zone not accross the wells.</p>