

Review of: "In-Vitro Antibacterial Activity of some Ganoderma Species: A Review"

Moira Madeo¹

¹ Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript entitled as “*In-Vitro Antibacterial Activity of some Ganoderma Species: A Review*” requires to be completely revised. Despite the efforts of the authors the manuscript is poorly written.

The authors present an important topic. The diabetic foot ulcers (DFU) are among the most common complications of patients who have diabetes mellitus, imposing a significant burden on the community and on the individual patient. However, the manuscript lacks a strong conceptual framework.

There are many aspects to be amended in this manuscript; these are summarized below:

1) The choice of the title should be reconsidered. In the manuscript different biological activities are mentioned, including antiviral and antifungal. The diabetic foot ulcers was supposed to be the main topic. In the title the disease should be mentioned.

2) The abstract is poorly written and misleading. Moreover, *Ganoderma* spp. is not a plant.

3) The introduction requires a better structure, providing solid foundations. many statements are not supported by appropriate references. The sentence “Ethanol extracts ... antifungal activity.” The statement “ According to the WHO, **medicinal plants...**”. just to cite a few examples.

Furthermore, the bacterial communities of infected ulcers should be revised. The authors cited Heravi et al., 2019. In the manuscript the authors scrupulously discussed the sample collection sites, the commensal microflora (for example *Bacillus subtilis*) and the pathogenic bacteria. I am also wondering about the *Salmonella* spp that is here reported in the mixture of bacteria found in DFU .

4) The hypoglycemic activity of *Ganoderma* spp. is insufficiently described and poorly documented. The safety of *Ganoderma* spp. extracts as dietary supplements should be discussed.

5) The part regarding the methodologies used to test *Ganoderma* spp. Such as extracts/nanoparticles, copper oxide, anti-biofilm, etc, is not clear. Results are not well discussed. The Table 1 is not related to the diabetic foot ulcers' microflora.

6) Terms like “common antibiotics” and “medicinal products” should be replaced by more appropriate terms.

7) Abbreviations such as EtOH extracts should be avoided.

8) The conclusions should be vastly expanded.9) Throughout the whole document, please carefully check all the typographical and grammatical errors.

Overall, I suggest that the authors provide an extensive revisions of this interesting topic.