



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">South Asian Journal of Research in Microbiology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SAJRM_53685
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Phytochemical Constituents and Antibacterial Activity of Chromolaena Odorata L. Against Selected Multidrug Resistant Bacteria From Wounds
Type of the Article	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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Title</b> Needs revision to give more value to the present study</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> 1/ The reported information in the introduction section are general especially in the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. For instance, it is better to report new statistics and prevalence of the studied strains. The paragraphs mentioning the ethnopharmacological preparations of the studied plant need more revision of English and reformulations. 2/ We suggest to remove the paragraph about generalities on antibiotics and to add recent studies about the phytochemical characterization of <i>Chromolaena odorata</i> based on literature.</p> <p><b>Materials and methods</b> 1/ The sentence "A swab sample per patient was professionally collected by medical practitioners to avoid surface contamination" can be replaced by the simple sentence: A swab sample was aseptically collected from patient. 2/ The voucher specimens number of the studied plant is required 3/ the extraction in hot water at 100 °C for 24H could destroy the phytochemical compounds 4/ the use of DMSO at 30% could be toxic against microbial strains, a negative control should be tested, have the authors done a negative control using DMSO at 30%? If yes we would like to see the photos</p> <p><b>Results and discussion</b> 1/ in table 1, the authors mentioned "cold water", however the extracts was prepared using hot water. Please explain. 2/ Between table 1 and table 2, the preliminary screening of saponins in the methanolic extract indicated an absence of this phytochemical group. However the quantification indicated 110.73±0.18<sup>b</sup>. The unit is not mentioned under the table. 3/ in table 3, the diameters of zone inhibitions presented for example as <b>2.67±1.33, 4.33±0.33, 5.00±0.00</b>...etc. However, the diameter of a disk or well is of 6mm, which means the minimum of an inhibition zone is 6 mm. How can you explain that? 4/ through all tables in the text, the units when it is necessary should be mentioned 5/ in table 5, we suggest to put not active for the aqueous extract much better than 0.00, because the diameter of the well is 6 mm. 6/ the authors mentioned in the methodology that they have purified the extracts and then</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>obtained some fractions. However in results we don't see the evaluation of the antibacterial effect of these fractions neither the chemical characterization.</p> <p>7/ in the discussion section, we suggest to report the pure compounds isolated from this species and to discuss the possible mechanism of action based on bibliography. To report also the important role of the phytochemical families that contains the studied plant.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>In conclusion section</b></p> <p>"<i>C. odorata</i> can serve as an alternative medicine", in this sentence authors can say as a possible source of alternative medicine. To recommend a plant as alternative medicine we have to pass by lot of process such as fractionation, isolation of pure active compounds, and evaluation of cytotoxicity, in vivo test and then preclinical studies. A long procedure is needed. For preliminary studies, all the results are a possible source for drugs and a first step.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Ikrane Zeouk</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Universidad de la Laguna, Spain</i></b>