



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

The study is interesting and presents new information to the existing information on the antimicrobial activity of *Acalypha wilkesiana*. The following observations were made:

TITLE

The title gives an impression that the comparison is between antibacterial and antifungal activities. The impression is further echoed by the aim in lines 116 and 117. I expect that the aim should be to compare different fractions of the extract on bacterial and fungal isolates because to compare bacteria vs. fungi is a mismatch.

Line 5: Space between *Acalypha* and *wilkesiana*

ABSTRACT

The abstract is not structured according to the Journal format as stated in the Instruction to authors. The instruction should be read and complied with.

INTRODUCTION

Lines 35-51: Many words are clustered together without spacing. Insert space where necessary.

Line 66: In text citations should not include initials of names. This is repeated in several places. I suggest that the authors read the instruction to authors or look at already published articles from the journal.

Line 68: Insert space between words. This is repeated in many places. Make corrections where necessary.

Lines 69-71: Meaning of the statement is not clear enough. Consider recasting the statement to bring out the intent more clearly.

Lines 73, 74 and 76: I suppose these are not single words. Separate them appropriately.

Line 75: Scientific name is not in italics. Write in italics and all scientific names in other places that are not in italics.

Lines 81-83: Which statement is credited to Nascimento et al. (2009)? If it is the first statement then the reference should come after “drugs” because a reference is not relevant for the second statement.

Lines 87-89a: The statement does not convey a clear message since all the compounds mentioned may be soluble in one or more of the mentioned solvents. Recast the statement to bring out the meaning clearer.

Line 89b: Plant referred to as a compound. That should not be.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Lines 94-96: Is a repeat of lines 92 and 93. Therefore it can be deleted.

Line 98: 'Used' not 'use'

Line 101: *A. wilkesiana* referred to as an annual plant. Clarify because the plant is perennial.

Lines 116 and 117: As stated already in the title portion. The aim may be like "To compare the antibacterial and antifungal potencies of different fractions of *Acalypha wilkesiana* methanol leaves extract against bacteria and fungi of medical importance". So that it will be clear that the comparison is between the extract and its fractions not between bacteria and fungi.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Line 121: Delete 'plant'

Plant collection and identification: There is no statement to indicate if identification was authenticated with a voucher number.

Lines 149 and 150: The biochemical tests used should be stated or at least a reference.

Lines 150-155: This portion is repeated in lines 158-162. It should be deleted.

Lines 162: Only CFU should be in parenthesis but if the '/ml' must also be in, then, 'per ml' should be written after 'units'

Lines 166-168: There should be space between a figure and its unit. This is repeated in several places. Corrections should be made where necessary.

Line 174: 'Measurements' not 'measurement'

Line 192: In vitro should be in italics also in line 223. Also, there should be a word to qualify antifungal e.g. In vitro antifungal activity was screened.....

Line 201: 'measurements' not 'measurement'

Line 207: Confirm the word. Is it 'prepared' or 'pipetted'?

Line 248: Delete 'of'

General comments: Mention how the extract and the various fractions were reconstituted before inoculation in terms of the solvent(s) used. This information may lead to inquiring why the experiment did not involve a negative control.



SDI Review Form 1.6

RESULTS

Table 2: Insert space between the genus and species name. This is repeated in several other places in the manuscript.

Table 3: I suggest a third column be created for antibiotic sensitivity so that the sensitivity profile can be seen at a glance without having to make deduction from the total number of antibiotics used.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Line 271: The reference should come at the end of the statement i.e. after formulation.

Line 274: Change 'has' to 'have'

Line 292b: Qualify the extract as 'crude methanol extract and its fractions' since there are a number of them. Unless if it is a specific fraction that is being referred to.

Line 305 and 306: The word 'preferential' is not relevant in this context. The work did not include safety studies thus the last statement can only stand if such a study is done or there is a reference to that effect.

GENERAL COMMENTS: In the light of the direction of this study, I suggest that Adesina et al., 2000 be studied well to see how it relates and can be added to strengthen the discussion.

REFERENCES

This section was generally poorly written. The deficiency of the in text citation has been stated earlier. The section should be re-written according to the journal format. Notably, Reference No. 1 (Adesina et al., 2000) should be checked because it appears it was not cited correctly. Check Phytotherapy Research 14, 371-374 (2000) or Malaysian Journal of Microbiology vol. 6(2) 2010, pp 69-74. For correct citation.

Note: Reference number 5 is quoted as Ezekiel et al., 2009 in the text while in the reference section it is written as C.N. Ezekiel.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract should be structured according to the journal format. 2. The concern raised about the aim should be addressed. 3. All editing concerns (spellings, grammar, unclear sentences, spacing) 4. References both in text and reference section should be corrected 5. Mention solvent(s) used to reconstitute the extracts. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract has been restructured. 2. The aim has been addressed as suggested by reviewer. 3. Corrections have been made. 4. References both in text and reference section have been corrected. 5. Methanol was the solvent used.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthening of discussion with suggested reference. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The discussion has been beefed-up.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stating the biochemical tests used to identify the organisms or a reference. 2. Additional column for Table 2 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. References stating the biochemical tests used to identify the organisms have been included as suggested. 2. Additional column for Table 2 was created as suggested.