

Review of: "Efficacy of *Anogeissus leiocarpus* as a Therapeutic Agent for Some Pathogenic Bacteria"

Nor Afifah Supardy¹

¹ Aimst University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract:

1. The type of extracts of *A. leiocarpus* should be stated - i.e., ethanolic/aqueous extract of *A. leiocarpus*
2. Choice of solvents was ethanol and aqueous. Both are polar-group solvents and commonly extract more or less the same group of phytochemicals (i.e., polyphenols, flavonoids, vitamins, and other active compounds).
3. The bacterial name that was susceptible to the extract is better to be more specific (Genus, species), instead of just being mentioned as 'tested bacteria'.

Introduction:

1. Paragraph 3 - studied by Victor 2013 on the same plant species, can add the types of bacteria that were susceptible.
2. Paragraph 5 - in the purpose of the study, instead of mentioning 'some pathogenic bacteria', it is suggested to group the tested bacteria into their specific groups - respiratory tract infections, GIT, or UTI. These types of infections have been mentioned in the earlier paragraph.

Materials and Methods:

1. Extraction method needs to be mentioned, i.e., maceration/soaking extraction/liquid–solid extraction/ Soxhlet extraction.
2. Typo in the spelling of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Klebsiella penumoniae*
3. The McFarland standard used should be cited. The unit for 10^7 is missing (cells/ml or CFU). Normally, the standard McFarland used for antimicrobial susceptibility testing is 0.5 McFarland, which is equivalent to 1.5×10^8 cells/ml.
4. Antibacterial test - it is suggested to change "bacteria was 'streaked'" to "inoculate/spread evenly," as streaked is a method to obtain single colonies.

Results:

1. The qualitative phytochemical analysis - statements were quite confusing, recommend clearly mentioning the type of extracts (ethanol/aqueous) instead of just leaf extracts. Also, need to clearly identify which is qualitative and which is quantitative analysis
2. Table 2, 3, 4, 5 need to be more organized (add more columns) in order to efficiently present the results.

Discussion and Conclusion

1. The points of discussion were present; however, some sentences should be re-paragraphed to make the discussion clearer - 'The quantity of chemicals screened from the ethanol extract could result from the antibacterial potency it exhibited over the aqueous extract in this study.'
2. Paragraph 3 - previous findings of *A. leiocarpus* on the antibacterial activity need to mention the types of extract/solvent used, in order to compare/relate to current findings.

Conclusion:

1. Conclusion is recommended to be more specific to the plant of the current study, not in general about plant extracts.

All paragraphs should be justified; some typos need corrections.