

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_86284
Title of the Manuscript:	Preliminary Antibacterial Screening of the Whole Stem of Rothmania whitfieldii
Type of the Article	Original research article

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is well-written and nicely presented. The authors provide the first report on the antibacterial activity of R. whitfieldii which adds to the ensemble of medicinal plants with therapeutic potential. They tested the hypothesis of the antibacterial activity of whole stem extract of R. whitfieldii, which was distinct between water (hot and cold) and ethanolic extracts. However, the paper needs a discussion section to pull together all of the results and discuss its relevance in the wider scientific context.</p> <p>Some suggestions to improve this manuscript are as follows:</p> <p>1) Why only choose the stem of R. whitfieldii?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Have the authors or others compared the extract of flower or leaves of this plant?</li> <li>-If not, regardless, additional explanation on how the compounds from extracts of these different parts would be different.</li> </ul> <p>2) Please include an explanation on why MIC and MBC of some bacterial strains in Table 4-7, etc was not determined or zero.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Did the authors fail to observe growth inhibition/lethal concentration using the diffusion method? Or because it was not tested against?</li> <li>-If possible, it is strongly recommended to re-assess MIC &amp; MBC with other methods such as broth dilutions or time-kill test that could help resolve this problem. The results will significantly elevate the relevance of this study.</li> </ul> <p>3) Please include a discussion section which elaborates all of the results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Despite lack of previous study on R. whitfieldii as a therapeutic, there are other studies studies which have already identified some components of this plant (see: <a href="https://www.scirp.org/html/2-2160111_92589.htm">https://www.scirp.org/html/2-2160111_92589.htm</a>).</li> <li>-The authors need can also associate R. whitfieldii with other studies on Rothmannia species or the like to provide a stronger suggestion on its potential as an antibacterial/a therapeutic agent based on scientific merits.</li> <li>-Please include potential compounds that could be present in the hot, cold water and ethanolic extracts that would differentially impact the antibacterial activity. This can be extrapolated based on studies on other medicinal plants (if previous R. whitfieldii study is not available).</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	-----	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Incorporated above.	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ayeshah A. Rosdah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Sriwijaya, Indonesia</b>