

Review of: "Antimicrobial Sensitivity of Plant Extracts of *Acacia arabica*, *Prosopis juliflora*, *Abutilon indicum*, and *Bryonia laciniata* on *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and *Escherichia coli*"

Liziane Schittler¹

¹ Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

"The topic covered is relevant; however, the manuscript presents several issues that I consider inappropriate for publication. Among the problems identified:

Title: It is necessary to correct the title to a clearer and more precise formulation, such as "Who is responsible for sensitivity: the extract or the microorganisms?"

Grammatical errors: The manuscript contains grammatical errors, such as "microbes," which should be corrected.

Evaluated properties of the extracts: In the text, only the antimicrobial activity of the extracts is mentioned. It is important to clarify what other properties of the extracts were evaluated, if any, for a complete understanding of the study.

Summary: The summary does not include the results and conclusion of the study. This information is essential for a complete summary.

Keywords: It is necessary to review the keywords, as some of them are already part of the title of the manuscript.

Material and methods: There must be a detailed description of the ATCC standard strains or isolates of bacteria used. This information is essential for the replicability of the study.

Introduction: Since the introduction states that the extracts have antimicrobial activity, it is pertinent to question the need to evaluate this activity again. I suggest reviewing and justifying the inclusion of this analysis.

Tables and figures: The tables mentioned in the introduction should be removed and placed as supplementary material. Be sure to add captions to plant-related figures and include information about the identification and background paper used in the photographs, especially figure 2.2, which requires significant improvement before it can be considered publishable.

Discussion of results: The discussion section needs to be rewritten to more clearly and concisely address the results presented.

Literature review: The literature review is outdated, with 49% of references dated more than 10 years ago. It is essential

to update the bibliography, incorporating more recent studies to strengthen the theoretical basis of the manuscript. The inclusion of references dated after 2019 is especially important."