SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

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 *Acalyphawilkesiana.***

General guideline for Peer Review process: *(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)*

- *Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.*
- Materials & methods *(Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)*
- Results & discussion (*Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- Conclusion *(Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them*)
- Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?
- SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.
- We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.
- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	**1.Mean ± sd is incorrectly reported in the Tables, for example 7.0±0.41 is better reported as 7.0±0.4** **2.Most scientific names are wrongly reported, for example *Acalyphawilkesiana* should be *Acalypha wilkesiana.*** **Paper is generally well written, but it has not extended our knowledge about what is known and acknowledged about *Acalypha wilkesiana.***	
Minor REVISION comments	**Exclude vertical lines in all Tables. Limit horizontal lines to the first row of column titles and the last line of the last row.**	
Optional/General comments	**Well written paper but lacks novelty. Authors may like to consult the following papers:**	

	By Adesina, S. Kola; Oguntimein, B. Jide; Akinwusi, D. Doye Phytochemical and biological examination of the leaves of Acalypha wilkesiana (red acalypha, Euphorbiaceae) • From Quarterly Journal of Crude Drug Research (1980), 18(1), 45-8. | Language: English, Database: CAPLUS • Exts. when tested for antimicrobial activity using the agar diffusion method showed antimicrobial properties against 7 test organisms, viz., Bacillus cereus, B. subtilis, Escherichia coli, Klebsiella pneumoniae, Proteus vulgaris, Serratia marcescens, and Staphylococcus aureus NCIB 8588. • By Adesina, S. K.; Idowu, O.; Ogundaini, A. O.; Oladimeji, H.; Olugbade, T. A.; Onawunmi, G. O.; Pais, M. Antimicrobial constituents of the leaves of Acalypha wilkesiana and Acalypha hispida • From Phytotherapy Research (2000), 14(5), 371-374. | Language: English, Database: CAPLUS • An activity directed fractionation of a 50% aq. ethanol ext. of A. wilkesiana and A.	

	hispida leaves resulted in the isolation of gallic acid, corilagin and geraniin as the compds. responsible for the obsd. antimicrobial activity. Quercetin 3-O-rutinoside and kaempferol 3-O-rutinoside were also isolated from the inactive fraction of A. hispida. The structures were established by permethylation, 2D-NMR (1H and 13C) and MS data	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer