

Editor's Comment:

The manuscript **2021/SAJRM/65412** was rejected because it has the following errors:

- a good scientific article does not have figures in the Introduction section; still, this item must contain the state of the art (subject) as well as this research will contribute to society; this manuscript has only 3 paragraphs, very long and not very explanatory (it is very superficial); the last paragraph in the objective is very vague; anyway, what is the real purpose of this study !!
- gross errors in the writing of scientific names e.g. Bacillus **cerius** and Pseudomonas **aerugenosa** (Bacillus cereus and Pseudomonas aeruginosa)
- the manuscript contains item 2.6 Statistical analysis, but nothing was written; not included in the tests used, and the manuscript also does not have statistical analysis on the results
- the results should be presented in a more scientific way, justifying the data obtained, e.g. why has it only resulted from MIC for 2 bacteria? what about the others ?? what is the relevance of repeating the data in table 1 in figure ??? (Fig. 4).
- discussion item: what is the difference between Sudanese Doum and other Doum? the aim of the research was "Few scientific investigations were done concerning the biological activities of Sudanese Doum" however, if we do not highlight the difference between the plants, there is a lot of work reporting the antagonistic issue
- the authors report the importance of consuming Doum as "a possible antimicrobial dietary supplement, especially in light of the growing phenomena of antibiotic-resistant pathogens" ... however the studies were carried out as a methanolic extract; explain if the consumption efficiency will be equal to the extract efficiency !!!!

due to the lack of important information and unscientific writing, we chose to **reject** the manuscript.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Luciana Furlaneto-Maia

Lecturer, Federal Technological University of Parana, Brazil