

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_84479
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of in vitro activity of antimicrobial potential and phytochemical screening of methanol extract of Curcuma longa rhizome against some clinical isolates
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:

(<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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1) Please rewrite the paragraph: “Approximately 50% of contemporary pharmaceuticals are derived directly or indirectly from plants, with approximately 80% of the population in developing nations dependent only on plants for their medical needs [6, 7]. Several pieces of research have indicated that medicinal plants contain bioactive chemicals that have been successful as pharmaceutical raw materials [8]. Medicinal plants, according to the World Health Organization (WHO), would be the best source of a range of pharmaceuticals. Traditional medicine, which contains substances derived from medicinal plants, was utilized by almost 80% of people in developed countries [9].”</p> <p>It's redundant repeating the same information in different ways.</p> <p>2) Clarify if the sample is the extract or the powder of plant: “For 48 hours, 20g of the sample was soaked in 100mls of various solvents including n-hexane, distilled water...”</p> <p>3) Where are the clinical isolates? From what patients? Provide the information about origin of them and patient conditions.</p> <p>4) Why American Type Culture Collection standards were not used as a comparison? If it is possible provide the test or zone of inhibition with the positive controls.</p>	<p>It has been corrected.</p> <p>It was the powdered extract and it has been corrected.</p> <p>A clinical isolate is a clinical isolate irrespective of the source. Some were from urine, wound, sputum and HVS. What is important is that they are clinical isolates. As for the conditions of the patient, I am not a medical Doctor. I am a Medical Laboratory Scientist, my job is to work on the specimen/samples and provide results to the Medical Doctor.</p> <p>American Type Culture Collection standards were not used but standard antimicrobials were used as positive controls (Ciprofloxacin and fluconazole) and DMSO was used as negative control.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1) Change <i>Curcuma longa</i> to <i>C. longa</i> after the first use of the scientific name and check if it is in italic.</p> <p>2) There is a lot of repetition of plant, please change some for synonyms</p> <p>“Many plants have been utilized for their antibacterial properties, which are attributed to phytochemicals produced in the plant's secondary metabolism. Plants are loaded with a large array of secondary metabolites including tannins, alkaloids, phenolic compounds, and flavonoids, which have been found in vitro to have antimicrobial properties [2].”</p> <p>3) There is repetition of “were used”: “A total of seven clinical isolates were used were used for this study.”</p> <p>4) Put the scientific name italic: “The antibacterial activity of methanolic extract of <i>Curcuma longa</i> as represented in Table 1 shows that the extract...”</p> <p>5) Correct the scientific name that is incomplete: “At low concentration there was no effect on <i>Staph aureus</i> and <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> ...”</p> <p>6) Use when instead of with: “<i>Aspergillus flavus</i>, with concentrations of the extract were used in their study.”</p>	<p>All these have been addressed</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The field chosen is scientifically important, particularly after rise of resistance by antibiotics overuse at the last years. The manuscript presents few gaps, but it does not decreases the contribution to future drug development.</p>	

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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	<p>There are no ethical issues, the authors did not work directly with human, permission was sought from the Head of Department of Microbiology, University of Nigeria Teaching Hospital to allow us used the isolates and some of their facilities and this was granted.</p>