



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_54318
Title of the Manuscript:	Ethnobotanical surveys, antibacterial activity and phytochemical screening of extracts of <i>Prosopis africana</i> (Guill. & Perr.) Taub
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Place and Duration of Study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The ethnobotanical survey was conducted during June 2015 (Methodology indicate 2014) in Zounweogo Province... " - the Methodology section indicate Department not Province – make all the same 2. Methodology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "...determination of the minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) of extracts - indicate method. • "The phytochemical constituents of all extracts was also screened (via ?)" - indicate method. 3. Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicate the bacterial infections treated with this species. • Indicate mode of administration as per methodology above 4. Add keywords 5. FOR ADDITIONAL EDITORIAL ISSUES REFER TO THE ACCOMPANIED ANNOTATED MANUSCRIPT. <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Sentences 1-2: Low quality information in opening statement of paragraph- remove –Get straight to the point as quickly as possible. All redundant information should be removed from Introduction – only very pertinent information is to be provided. 7. "Unfortunately, about half of them were from developing countries like Burkina Faso [1]." - This sentence is meaningless as the other half would be from developed countries. 8. "Among them, bacteria occupied an important place in the occurrence of these diseases [2]" - this sentence is meaningless – remove. Rather indicate factors that lead to infectious diseases. 9. "For that, the scientific world has discovered many remedies in order to remain the damage caused by these microorganisms in patients. The objectives of these remedies were to reduce the incidence of infectious diseases, especially in developed countries[5]" – Low quality information – remove 10. Seeing that these 3 bacteria forms part of this investigation, more should be stated about them so that the reader understands the context of the bacteria and their adverse impact on society (economically and mortality). 11. More should be stated about the traditional use of this species in treating microbial infections, particularly bacterial infections & also related to leaves as well as the bark of roots and stems (in order to validate their use in this study). 12. Indicate the problem statement that led you to investigate this particular species, especially in the study area. 13. The study is of value because ... (indicate value of investigation for study area and other similar areas or traditional healers). 14. FOR ADDITIONAL EDITORIAL ISSUES REFER TO THE ACCOMPANIED ANNOTATED MANUSCRIPT. <p>METHODOLOGY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15. Description of study area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ethnobotanical survey was conducted in the (department – the abstract indicate Province not department – which is it? Or is there a department of Zounweogo within the province of Zounweogo? - clarify) • why do we absolutely need to know the population number of this study area in order to understand the results? – if not absolutely necessary, then remove 16. Do not put the legend in a text box 17. Ethnobotanical survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ethnobotanical survey was conducted during June 2014 (Abstract indicate 2015) 18. Extractions procedure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extract methods descriptions are incomplete and does not lend itself to repeatability – which is the cornerstone of science – update section 2.4 19. Bacterial strains <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the laboratory certified as a biosafety level 2 facility? Clarify! 20. You are mixing American and British English - adhere to only 1 21. Statistical analysis 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>“Prism Graph Pad version 5.00 software was used to measure the degree of significance of the results using the ANOVA one-way comparison test. A significant difference was considered for $p < 0.5$.” – where is the ANOVA results?</p> <p>22. FOR ADDITIONAL EDITORIAL ISSUES REFER TO THE ACCOMPANIED ANNOTATED MANUSCRIPT.</p> <p>RESULTS</p> <p>23. Ethnobotanical survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The age categories were NOT specified in the Methodology –correct his oversight <p>24. Antibacterial activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing is stated about the efficacy of the Aqueous decoction and Aqueous maceration – correct this oversight! section 2.4 indicate methanol, not ethanol <p>25. Phytochemical screening</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary? - nowhere in methodology section was it indicated that this was a preliminary screening <p>26. FOR ADDITIONAL EDITORIAL ISSUES REFER TO THE ACCOMPANIED ANNOTATED MANUSCRIPT</p> <p>DISCUSSION Discussion to be totally reformulated according to the following format:</p> <p>4.1 Ethnobotanical survey Aspects to be discussed: – otherwise why did you present these results?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Age Gender/sex Infections treated Most frequently plant part Preparation mode Administration mode <p>4.2 Antibacterial activity Aspects to be discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results presented in Table 3 and Table 4 <p>4.3 Phytochemical screening Results presented in Table 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Root bark Stem bark Leaves <p>26. FOR ADDITIONAL EDITORIAL ISSUES REFER TO THE ACCOMPANIED ANNOTATED MANUSCRIPT</p> <p>27. Discussion only via comparison with other studies is not discussion! See how other published articles handled the discussion.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Grammar general poor – please proofread before a next submission	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is permeated by numerous unforced errors – please proofread before a next submission	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Martin Potgieter</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Limpopo, South Africa</i>