Review of: "Efficacy of Anogeissus leiocarpus as a Therapeutic Agent for Some Pathogenic Bacteria"

Enitan Adesanya[1]

1 Olabisi Onabanjo University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

ABSTRACT:

Methodology: The authors should clearly state the solvents used for extractions.

Results: The authors should rewrite that section because it is showing that for each extract, a different phytochemical screening test was conducted. But I think they wanted to report the outcomes from each extract.

Also, in the antibacterial assay, instead of inhibition, it should be changed to zones of inhibition

INTRODUCTION:

The many ways of their prevention and cure with folklore have helped immensely in recent times. Need reconstruction.

Suggestion: In many ways, their prevention and cure with folklore have helped immensely in recent times.

The majority of urban and rural dwellers - Check the spelling

MATERIALS AND METHODS

in vacuo - *in vacuo* (italics)

Glycoside determination: The authors should explain how they got the weight of glycoside in the extracts.

0.004 ml of extract - 0.004 mL of extract

Also, did the authors conduct a control experiment?

The first tube in the series with no visible growth after the incubation period was taken as the MIC. - The authors should clarify the first tube/lowest concentration tube with no visible growth?

0.5 mL of 0.1 mm 1, 1-diphenyl 1-2 picrylhidrazyl (DPPH) radical - Did the authors mean mg/mL?

between 0 to 1.6 mg/mL – 100 mg/mL - The authors should look into these concentration ranges.

RESULTS

Observation from this study proved that the ethanol extract has a higher potency than the aqueous extract – needs

reconstruction.

50 mg/ml - 50 mg/mL

The lipid contents of the ethanol leaf extract were 4.18±0.4 and 3.11±0.2 for the aqueous extract. Crude protein content was 15.36±0.5 and 15.36±0.5 for ethanol and aqueous extracts, respectively. The ash contents were 6.24±1.5 and 5.28±0.4 for ethanol and aqueous extracts, respectively. The carbohydrate content for ethanol was 68.16±1.2 and 56.27±0.6 for the aqueous extract. The crude fibre content was higher in the aqueous extracts (7.34±1.4) than in the ethanol extract (6.56±1.6) - units should be inserted.

The amount of nitrogen content in the ethanol extract was 4.16, while it was 4.12 in the aqueous extract. Unit inserted.

Values of 0.56±0.60, 1.18±0.11, and 1.76±1.3 were recorded for HRS, FRAP, and FRAS, respectively, in the ethanol extract, while it was 7.3±0.4, 1.24±0.2, and 1.61±0.1 for HRS, FRAP, and FRAS, respectively, in the aqueous extract. - Unit inserted.