

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_82774
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial Activity of Composite Mixture of Senna siamea Leaves and Tamarind pulp Extracts on Multidrug Resistant Salmonella typhi
Type of the Article	Full research paper

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:

(<https://www.journalejmp.com/index.php/EJMP/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract should be reviewed where highlighted.</p> <p>The abstract was clear and concise however there were certain sections were not effectively connected. Elaborate the background to mention the use of Senna and Tamarind for treatment of certain diseases. That will improve the transition to the aim. In the introduction, there is a lack of clarity with regards to the three isolates. I imagine that 168 stool samples were collected, out of which 3 isolates were obtained. This needs to be clearly stated in both abstract and methods.</p> <p>Author should also justify the use of DMSO rather than water as well as clearly state % DMSO achieved. This is important as DMSO is known to be toxic at a certain level.</p> <p>In the methods section, the voucher number was not stated for the plant specimen. It was also unclear if a voucher specimen was allocated to both Senna and tamarind. The author should clarify drying method and be explicit. It stated that extract was dried at room temperature after extraction. The exact method this was achieved should be explicitly stated.</p> <p>It was stated that descriptive statistics was used for analysis. The results was not shown. Statistical analysis was not detailed.</p> <p>Finally, improve organisation by separating results from methods. Have a discussion section and results should mainly focus on presenting and interpreting results. The discussion should link your results to wider literature and relate to the statistical results.</p>	<p>All the necessary corrections were done as indicated</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Introduction section: Reference format errors and punctuation (see in-text review comment).</p> <p>Correct grammar and punctuation is areas highlighted.</p> <p>Use botanical names for both extracts and be consistent (see in text comments).</p>	<p>Revised</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	