

Review of: "[Review] The antibacterial activity of *Allium sativum*, *Thymus vulgaris*, *Origanum vulgare*, *Curcuma longa*, *Rosmarinus officinalis*, and *Cinnamomum* species against various antibiotic-resistant strains of bacteria: A Literature Review"

Tsegu Kiros¹

¹ Haramaya University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- The TITLE is too lengthy and seems vague. It is better to modify it as "A review on antibacterial activity of six commonly used medicinal plants against various antibiotic-resistant bacterial strains".
- The information provided under section 1.1 is a bit limited to say "a brief history". It is therefore better either to expand it more or merge subsections 1.1 & 1.2.
- The first three paragraphs in subsection 1.3 talk only about the case of US and seem like a case study. It should indicate what the world's statistics look like.
- The content stated under literature review (section 2) should be placed under the introduction part at the end of 1.4 subsection.
- The abbreviation for plant and microbial names should be written properly.
- It is better to modify section 6 as "Antibacterial Activity of Selected Botanicals against Antibiotic-Resistant Bacterial Strains". And then subsections 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 can be modified as "Antibacterial activity against *S. aureus*, *S. pneumoniae*, *P. aeruginosa*, *E. coli*, *C. jejuni*, and *S. typhimurium*, respectively." Besides, the narration about each bacterial strain under each of the above subsection is very interesting. But, it is good to take it to the literature review (section 2).
- It is also better to take the information stated in sections 7 to 9 to the Literature Review (section 2) as it is not part of the search result.
- In this review only "PubMed" was used as a search engine and this can be considered as a limitation and should be mentioned in section 10.
- In the reference part it is better to avoid the bullet.