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"

Emad Abdallah[1]

1 Qassim University

I recommend rejecting the current form of this study.

The title:

The manuscript's title exceeds optimal length and includes superfluous information, namely the specific names of six plant species.

The abstract:

The research objective lacks clarity and justification. What prompted the selection of these particular plants for investigation against these specific bacteria? Was the study conducted in a randomized manner or based on a predetermined rationale?

The conclusion in the Abstract is also misleading! Did you study on bacteria in general or against antibiotic-resistant bacteria in particular?

The Introduction:

The introduction extensively discusses antibiotics, while the title of the paper does not adequately reflect this aspect.

Misleading and incorrect information:

Example: "In the US, there are several botanicals that are commonly used and may be capable of eradicating microbes resistant to antibiotics or MDR strains of bacteria. These herbs include garlic". Does US really use these plants against pathogenic bacteria???

Distracting targets:

"The purpose of this literature review is to analyze and evaluate………………… as bacteriostatic and bactericidal agents against…….." Your study aimed to evaluate bacteriostatic and bactericidal???

Generally, the Introduction section of your scientific paper lacks the inclusion of a crucial element of tension.

Methodology:

As acknowledged in the "Abstract," the study is identified as a narrative review. However, you now indicate the inclusion of meta-analysis, which is not evident within this narrative review!

Why (Table 1) is in the "Methodology" section???

Results:

Where is these 71 articles? no information!

Discussion

"Discussion" is very poor, lacking sufficient depth and informative content.

The remaining sections serve primarily as fillers, and the manuscript exhibits substandard production quality, rendering it unworthy of publication.