



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	• The abstract needs to be review by the authors because it is marred with technical, grammatical and punctuation error. Similarly, the abstract methodology section needs to be re-written. The authors should describe the extraction process of the plants before given the methodology for antimicrobial study. The conclusion section also needs to be re-written. • The introduction is marred with technical, grammatical and punctuation error. It is not informative enough and not well structured. • This statement in the introduction section need to be reversed and appropriate references provided. "Ethnic people are healthy and have less morbidity and higher life expectancy. They consume almost all of the plant and animal foods, especially those consumed by birds and monkey; thus they naturally screen edible and poisonous foods". • The authors should include brief information of the plants in the introduction section and the objectives of study well spelt out. • The voucher number for each identified plant materials should be included in the manuscript. • The details for the plants (Table 1) are inappropriate in the methodology section it should be in introduction section. • The authors should carried out minimum inhibition concentration (MIC) and minimum	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	bactericidal concentration (MBC) assay for the plant to established their antibacterial potential. • The preparation of the crude extract is not informative. The authors should described how fresh extract was prepared (what solvent was used for its extraction?). • The methodology need to be re-written. • The authors should provide appropriate reference for the antimicrobial studies. • The result and discussion section is not informative and is marred with with technical, grammatical and punctuation error. Thus, needs to be re-written. • The conclusion is not appropriate and suggestion for further studies should be included.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	• The authors should check spelling, technical, and grammatical errors. • The manuscript required overall editing.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is marred with technical, grammatical and punctuation error. The authors need to carry out MIC and MBC assay of the plant extracts to substantiate their antibacterial potential.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>F. O. Osunsanmi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Biochemistry and Microbiology, University of Zululand, South Africa</i>