

Editor's comments:

The manuscript needs some corrections

Title Public (not pulic)

1) IN-VITRO ANTIBACTERIAL ACTIVITY AND PHYTOCHEMICAL SCREENING OF PSIDIUM GUAJAVA ON SOME ENTERIC BACTERIAL ISOLATES OF PUBLIC HEALTH IMPORTANCE

2) line 80 Whatman

Table 1

3) lines 120-121

with *Shigella* spp being the most susceptible isolate at 200 mg/ml concentration (23.6mm) and *Salmonella typhi* the least susceptible (11.3 mm).

As far as I understand the table, *S. typhi* is inhibited both by ALE as well as by ELE (18.3 and 18.6, respectively)

the least susceptible is *P. aeruginosa*, especially for ALE (11.0 at 100 mg/ml and 10.3 at 150, with no linear increase, and 12,6 at 200 mg/ml)

General comments:

The manuscript is based on a dosage of the material by weight

Twenty five gram (25g) each of fine powder of the plant materials was dissolved in 250ml. The solid residues obtained were reconstituted in 5% DMSO and water at stock concentration

...wells that were formed were filled with different concentrations of the extract which were labeled accordingly; 200 mg/ml, 150 mg/ml, 100 mg/ml and 50 mg/ml

there is no quantification of the compounds and their concentration (i.e. by chromatographic peaks)

It is a pity that the authors have not collected further information on the components, to understand the differences in the extracts

Authors' feedback:

1. The title had been corrected
2. Whatman had been corrected
3. *P. aeruginosa* had been considered as the least susceptible
4. The concentration is based on the quantity of the extracted plant materials in ratio to the amount of 5% DMSO used in making the solution/extract. For example 1g of extracted plant materials was dissolve in 5ml of 5%DMSO to produce 200mg/ml of the extract while dissolving 1g in 10ml produced 100mg/ml