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

Richard Oriko Owor[1]

1 Busitema University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall Remark: Reject the manuscript. Authors did not display adequate science in the subject matter being addressed and there is no novelty.

Review description

Section	Observation and Way Forward
Title	Since lowercase was used, the scientific style of writing scientific names is relevant. Since the organisms are bacteria, replace "antimicrobial" with "antibacterial"
Abstract	Section written with the segments required. However, in: • Background— state the form (leaves, roots, etc.) of the plants used for the study. • Methods— remove the purpose of the study in the methods. Show only methods used and not results either. • Results— No clear results were observed here. Re-write the abstract and include the implication of the findings.
Introduction	This section is too bulky and not related to the title. It needs to be revised to reflect only the problem and gaps being addressed in the current manuscript • Summarize this section into three paragraphs at most. • Show the implication of the bacteria studies on human health. • Link the bacteria to plants and show how relevant is to determine the sensitivity of the plant extracts on the bacteria. • Results should not be discussed in this section (second paragraph in page 2) • Summarize the phytochemistry and botany of the plants • What is the purpose of section 1.5? • I have observed that some of the antibacterial activities of the plants under investigation were previously evaluated. For example, extract of A. arabica was evaluated against Pseudomonas aeruginosa and P. juliflora against E. coli etc. the authors should justify the relevance of their investigation.
Materials and methods	• The section was poorly written. No clarity and reproducibility are reflected. The English should be improved. • Re-write the section precisely and technically. • Were the plant samples collected from the same GPS point? • I am quite sure of the relevance of figure 2.2 and table 2.3
Results	A part from the table showing the ZOI, the rest of the results are not clear, precise, and well presented as expected. • Section 3.3 communicates less and hence is not clear. • Section 3.4 is completely hard to interpret with ease.
Discussion	A comparison with the previous studies is outlined. However, • The discussion hardly links to the study topic. • The relevance of the study is not argued well. • Section 3.4 is not discussed. Generally, there is inadequate clarity in the discussed information.
Conclusion	This section should answer adequately the objectives/problem of the study and state a way forward.