



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 <i>Acalyphawilkesiana</i>.

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	<p>The problematic and the objective of the present contribution is very important. Moreover working with native plants, studied by the people of the regions. This search has interesting comparative studies with different pathogenic bacteria, and several strains of the same pathogen. Also described the sensivity/resistance of the pathogens with the antibiotics available in the market.</p> <p>However is very important to correct serious problems in redaction, in all manuscript. For example, Names of species, is Acalypha walkesiana separated, not Acalyphawalkesina, and many more.</p> <p>In experimental part, I feel there is too detail. is it correct 200 mg or is 200 grams of the dried and powered plant extracted? I feel is not necessary to include the figure 1, only improve the redaction of experimental part.</p> <p>It is important to indicate amounts and concentrations used in each assay. Then, how much obtained of each fraction, and how many used to each assay, in page 6 line169 "each inoculated plate and filled with 200 mg/ml". Clarify, please. In results and Discussion authors need to re-write some paragraphs to do clearer to reader, see pag 8</p>	<p>Names of species have been corrected</p> <p>Correction have been made in the experimental part. Authors prefer to retain figure 1.</p> <p>Corrections were made as suggested by</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	lines 227-229 . Need homogenizer the references and cites in the manuscript and in the references section, agree with the format of the journal.	reviewer. References cited in the manuscript and those in references sections have been corrected to agree with the format of the journal.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		