



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_32059
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial Activity of Ethnic Vegetables Consumed by the Ethnic People Living in Chittagong Hill Tracts
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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) Abstract (Results): In few places in the text appear words "shak" (sometimes written as "shack" . The English dictionary (Merriam-Webster) does not list the first, while the second is synonym of "a hut". Is it part of local name ? You should delete, change or explain these words. 2) Abstract (Results): The plant <i>Mangifera indica</i> L. is named as Kochi ammpata, however in Table 1 the name is aampata. Names should be the same in all places in the text. 3) Line 15: The first sentence of introduction is very vague. It does not state if we think of people from Chittagong Hill Tracts or ethnic people in general. We do not who we compare ethnic people with (maybe city dwellers). The most important is fact that there are no citation to prove that thesis. 4) Line 42: The name of paragraph has not been changed from the template. "Material and methods" will be all right. 5) Table 1: The scientific names of some plants are not full, for example <i>Ficus benghalensis</i> lacks L (for Linnaeus) in name 6) Line 70: In the text it is described that 250 µg of extracts was used per disc, while in Table 3 the value is 100 µg. 7) The results including use of <i>Pouzolzia hirta</i> and <i>Serratia</i> species are not included in Table 3. Why ? 8) The conclusions part should be expanded. 9) Authors should include the description of advantages and disadvantages of used method	1. Shak means vegetable in local language. It has been taken care of through the manuscript. 2. "Kochi" has removed. 3. This line has removed for not being substantiated. 4. Done as suggested. 5. Names has been rewritten. 6. It is 100 µg per disk. Corrected. 7. They are initially considered for using. Later omitted. 8. Conclusion was expanded. 9. Another paragraph has been added to the methods and materials describing the limitations of disk diffusion method. Misspelt words have been corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	(disc diffusion). It is important because it can have impact on the obtained results. <i>Misspellings:</i> <i>Abstract (Methodology): "Tracts" instead of "tracts"</i> <i>Abstract (Results): "Results" instead of "Resutls"</i> <i>Abstract (Results): "against all of the bacteria" instead of "against of of the bacteria"</i> <i>Table 2: "negative" instead of "negetitive"</i> <i>Table 2: "Staphylococcus" instead of "staphylococcus"</i> <i>Line 90: "Table" instead of "table"</i> <i>Line 105: there are numerous mistakes in this paragraph (like missing spaces); read it carefully and correct</i> <i>References: few minor mistakes</i>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) Title: I believe that term “indigenous people” would better describe the tribes you mentioned. 2) Abstract (Conclusions): I would recommend expanding this part. You must remember that often people read only the abstract of work. 3) Line 27: The words “the remaining 20% people living in developed countries also depend on plant medicines” are a little confusing as they are too similar to an earlier part of sentence. I suggest writing it a different way, for example “for the remaining 20% living in developed countries use of plant medicines also plays important role in the prevention and therapy of diseases” 4) Line 29: I think a new section should begin from words “Infection is...” 5) Table 1: I not recommend using abbreviations (like GIT) without their explanation. They can be unclear for some readers. 6) Line 109: The whole paragraph should rather be in Introduction part.	1. Corrected. 2. This part was expanded. 3. Corrected. 4. New section has began. 5. Elaborated. 6. It was thought necessary to begin the discussion in context.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript “Antibacterial activity of ethnic vegetables consumed by the ethnic people living in Chittagong Hill Tracts” describes series of experiments on antibacterial activity of plants indigenous for a region in Bangladesh. The authors chose 10 species of plants and tested their activity against several bacteria strains (both Gram-positive and negative). The experiments described in manuscript are presented clearly and the results can contribute to the search of novel antibacterial agents. However, the authors did not avoid mistakes including numerous misspellings (listed above), thus I recommend accepting this article after major corrections.	