

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*"

Mert Metin¹

¹ Mugla Sıtkı Kocman University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Please replace the term it is better to write antibacterial instead of antimicrobial and "Antimicrobial Sensitivityon..." by this term " " antibacterial Activityagainst..."

The graph is not clearly understandable. The results should be presented in clear and easily comprehensible formats, such that, even a beginner can read and understand the article.

Species names should be written in italics within the article, and the genus names after the first can be abbreviated.

The methodology is unclear. Some details would be needed, for example, how the bacterial inoculum was prepared and the incubation conditions for bacterial cultures, at least the ATCC culture number, temperature, duration.

Number of experiment repetitions (the inhibition zones) and statistical mean range of inhibition must always contain \pm , adding any statistical data.

The quality of photographs of the agar plates could be enhanced in order to better appreciate the inhibition zones.

The authors could have included more information about the phytochemicals that are present in the plant extracts which a toxicity study to assess the safety of the plant extracts.

The study compares its findings with some previous research, but a more comprehensive comparative analysis with discussing any discrepancies or variations in results between this study and previous ones would be more well.

In summary, Addressing these aspects would enhance the study's overall quality and impact.

These corrections may be published after they are made.