

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"

Katharina Nikutta (nee Doll)¹

¹ Medizinische Hochschule Hannover

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The 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" by Martin et al. aims at giving a summary of literature on the antibacterial effect of certain plant extracts on bacteria in the light of antibiotic resistance. Even though the topic is of solid relevance, the review has several weaknesses both methodologically as well as regarding content.

These include in detail:

Abstract: Give more introduction than only the aim of the study. The results stated here are obvious. What is the specific finding of this review? The conclusion is actually the missing introduction.

Introduction: Typically, an introduction is not divided into sections but the different topics follow each other in a logical order and are connected by the story told. The literature cited here is very limited. If these are reviews, the original references must be cited! Also, at the end an aims section is missing. Where are the limitations of the existing knowledge? Why is this review needed? What new insights does it want to give? Part of this is written under "Literature Review", which is a subheading that is not needed.

Methods: More than one database should be used. The results should include all literature older than 6 months (at the moment at least till end 2022). Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be listed point by point in a table. Was the search indeed limited to free full-text papers? This is an extremely hard criterion and most probably excludes a large number of relevant information. The authors should at least use all papers that are available via their university, both directly and upon request via their library. Table 1 should be titled as "Keywords for search strategy" or similar.

Results: This section should first of all contain a table listing all included studies and their major characteristics (besides content also journal and year). These should also be summarized in the text, e.g., how many for each bacterium and each compound, how it was analyzed etc.

Discussion: Chapter 6 and 7 belong to the discussion. Here, the major discussion should be limited to the findings in the literature research. Extensive descriptions of the bacterial physiology should not be included here and only in a shortened version in the introduction. Also, the simple reproduction of what has been written in the manuscripts is not the purpose of a review. Here, connections should be drawn, similarities and dissimilarities should be identified and hypotheses for their explanation should be derived.

I would suggest the authors to have a look in the structure of reviews of similar topics and use these as guideline for a major revision of their manuscript.