

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_112660
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibiofilm and Antibacterial Properties of Herbal Extracts as Alternatives to Current Treatment Approaches: A Comprehensive Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Comentários de REVISÃO obrigatórios</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please submit a few sentences in this manuscript). Yes, the review researches an important topic, which is the antibacterial and antibiofilm properties of plant extracts. The presence of bacterial biofilms represents a health challenge, as it harbors colonies of bacteria that are often resistant to antibiotics. A review addresses the potential of some herbs and their compounds as an alternative to combat biofilms of multidrug-resistant bacteria. 2. Is the article title appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title) Yes, the title is appropriate to what the authors researched; 3. Is the article summary comprehensive? Yes, however the authors provide a short description of the review methodology. 4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes, it is adequate; 5. The authors carried out a Systematic Literature Review. However, the methodology does not show how many articles were researched, how many were discarded and when they were included and considered in the Review. Authors should describe this methodology more completely, if possible in figure form. The authors mention in the text of the Review that a systematic search was carried out in databases from 2013 to 2023, to identify studies on the anti-biofilm and antibacterial properties of medicinal plants. However, there are several studies in the references prior to 2013. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention in the review form. The references contain 55% of scientific articles less than 10 years old, contradicting what the authors cite in the text. For a Systematic Literature Review, which seeks to update a topic, it is essential that the authors seek to carry out more up-to-date research. <p>(In addition to the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> <p>- The Systematic Literature Review has merit because the text is well written and well structured. However, the authors make a small mention of the methodology (lack of information on how many databases were researched, how many articles were researched, how many were discarded, what criteria were used, how many were actually used). It must be inserted in the form of a figure or table. I suggest you search the internet for examples of Systematic Literature Review</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>- The authors erroneously mention in the text that a search was carried out in databases from 2013 onwards. However, there are several references from years prior to 2013.</p> <p>- In view of this, I suggest that the authors describe in the methodology which databases were researched, how many articles were researched, how many were discarded, how many were used and insert them in the form of a table.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guido Laércio Bragança Castagnino
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Bahia, Brazil