

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_121150
Title of the Manuscript:	Preliminary phytochemical screening and antimicrobial activity of methanol extracts of <i>Usteria guineensis</i> and <i>Sphaerocoryne gracilipes</i> on common pathogens and isolates of Extended Spectrum Beta-Lactamases (ESBLs) producing <i>Escherichia coli</i>
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This research paper is a significant contribution to the field of ethnopharmacology and antimicrobial research. • The selection of two native African plants, traditionally used by rural communities for medicinal purposes, underscores the potential of indigenous knowledge in addressing contemporary health challenges. • By focusing on plants already in use for treating various diseases, the study not only validates traditional practices but also provides a scientific basis for their continued and expanded use. • The investigation into the antimicrobial activity against ESBLs and multidrug-resistant bacteria is particularly important in the current global context, where antibiotic resistance is a major public health concern. • The results showed that efficacy of these plants, could lead to the development of new, effective antimicrobial agents in further study. • Overall, this paper is a valuable addition to the literature, bridging the gap between traditional medicine and modern pharmacology. • It opens avenues for future research and underscores the importance of integrating traditional knowledge with scientific inquiry to combat global health issues. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Preliminary phytochemical screening and antimicrobial activity of <i>Usteria guineensis</i> and <i>Sphaerocoryne gracilipes</i> leaves extract on common pathogens and isolates of Extended Spectrum Beta-Lactamases (ESBLs) producing <i>Escherichia coli</i></p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author should add comparative results with positive and negative controls. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keywords are missing in manuscript • No issues with other subsections and structure of manuscript and are as per journal requirements. 	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript demonstrated a thorough and well structure literature review, showcasing the authors extensive research into the topic. • Author follows all the protocols for experiments as per standard procedure • cited all the required references of protocols in manuscript. • The citation of recent references strengthens the manuscript by highlighting the current state of research in this area. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The photographic plate of plant <i>Usteria guineensis</i> (Figure 2) took from other sources, so author should mention the reference. • All the references are not in proper format as per the journal requirement. • Some of the references does not have volume number, issue number or page number. • And some of references are even not written properly, missing proper information of source such as Reference no. 26. 	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manuscript have many grammatic and spelling mistakes which is need to correct. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> After first use of scientific name either plant of bacteria, it should be written in short form (<i>Escherichia coli</i>= <i>E. coli</i>). Always write scientific name in <i>italic style</i>, which is missing in introduction part for <i>E. coli</i>. Author should cite reference of original source of figure 2 plant photo. Mention If it is possible, mention geographical coordinates of plants where sample were collected for study. Environmental habitat can influence the diversity of production of secondary metabolites for the survival in that habitat. <p>Materials and Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 subsection heading should be change to “collection of plant materials”. 2.3 subsection- author write that they are analysing different plant part but in study he used only leaves of selected plant. So, they should be aware about what is they doing. 2.14 subsection: author should write proper symbol of degree. <p>Results and discussion:</p> <p>The antimicrobial assay results are not discussed properly such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> E3 bacteria recorded ZOI of 14 mm at 24mg/ml but at the 100mg/ml it recorded only 12mm ZOI which is four-time conc. of <i>Usteria guineensis</i> crude extract. Also, it shows No ZOI in positive control. At 25mg/ml of <i>Usteria guineensis</i> crude extract recorded 12mm ZOI against E5 and E8, whereas 100mg/ml of crude extract and Gentamycin recorded no ZOI. If we compare ZOI of E11, E12, E13 and E14 against positive control, all bacteria showed nearly equal ZOI which that crude extract have same efficacy of inhibition of bacteria as gentamycin. The ZOI against Pa recorded 11mm at both the Conc. and the plant extract, shos that 25mg/ml conc. of crude extract of both plant have same potency as 100mg/ml which is nearly equal to positive control. Stm recorded nearly equal ZOI to positive control. In discussion author didn't discuss about all these comparative results and even they didn't discus in abstract also. The antimicrobial results are not justifying because ZOI showing higher results at 25mg/ml that 100mg/ml which is not possible. All the experiments should be done at list three times, so that error cane be minimized. Which is not done in any experiments. The results are not statistically analyzed, and compared with standard drug. Author should analyze and compared results with positive and negative control by statistically using multiple comparisons test such ANOVA and Tukey multiple comparisons test. <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The conclusion can be stronger after analyzing all the results because as per result analysis both the plant leaves extract has more efficacy of antimicrobial activity which can be used as an alternative therapeutic agent.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kishor Singh Chouhan
Department, University & Country	Sangam University, India