

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"

Nemesio Villa-Ruano¹

¹ Benemerita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript is well written and includes old and new literature regarding the antimicrobial activity of the four plants addressed. However, in my opinion document structure should be improved based in the following points.

1. The section of Methods should be removed since readers are already aware on the fact that this is a review article.
2. Same for discussion section since a review paper must contain an implicit critical point of view of current findings based in literature cited.
3. Regarding last point, I was unable to detect criticism performed by authors. If no clear point of view or criticism is made by authors, this document is actually a monograph which is far from a review article.
4. For readers (including me) is hard to follow MIC values and phytochemicals without Figures or Tables. I revised both versions (HTML and PDF) and just saw a single Table. Authors need to draw chemical structures with proper footnotes and compile information in tables at least indicating type of component (extract/phytochemical), microorganisms affected and MIC value (or any other valid parameter to measure antimicrobial activity). If authors are focusing in resistant microorganisms they should include in the same table, MIC of standard antibiotics used to inhibit their normal growth.