

# 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*"

Nereida Gioppo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I consider the article important to assist in the search for plant extracts with potential antimicrobial activity, however I think that some details should be improved, especially in relation to the methodology.

When we use bacterial strains we must identify them. If the authors used non-standard strains, they should at least include where they were isolated from and the respective sensitivity profile of each.

They should explain in more detail, in the methodology, which extracts and from which plants were used, such as: extracts from leaves and seeds of *A. arabica* were used and so on.

I suggest removing the ZOI (zone of inhibition) graph, I don't see the need as it doesn't clarify the result at all.

Regarding the photos of the plates, they are not visible, and in the methodology, it was not explained what the letters A, B, C, D and E refer to. I think they could include in the methodology what each letter would be.

E.g. A= *A. arabica* leaf extract

I consider that the discussion of the results does not reflect the results found, they should mainly discuss the difference that occurred between the use of the aqueous extract and the ethanolic extract. Also discuss further the differences in sensitivity between the microorganisms used, since for *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* the extracts were ineffective and highlight that the ethanolic extract of *B. laciniata* leaves for *S. aureus* presented the greatest inhibition halo.

I disagree with the final conclusion precisely because it was not effective for all strains tested