



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_23097
Title of the Manuscript:	IN-VITRO EVALUATION OF ANTIBACTERIAL AND ANTIFUNGAL EFFICACY OF BOSWELLA DALZIELII STEM BARK EXTRACTS
Type of the Article	Original research Articles

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In Vitro and In Vivo Anti-trypanosomal Activity of Dichloromethane and Methanol Crude Leaf Extracts of <i>Dovyalis abyssinica</i> (Flacourtiaceae) against <i>Trypanosoma</i></p> <p>Title: the authors could consider the possibility on changing the title for</p> <p>“In vitro antimicrobial and antifungal efficacy of ethanol crude stem bark extract of <i>Boswellia dalzielii</i>”</p> <p>-The article is not entirely original. Some micro-organisms used herein have been tested against the ethanol extract previously. The novelty is the study of fungi activities. Thus, it is necessary a comparison of the results found in Table 4 for antimicrobial activities with those of the reference 44 and others references in the literature.</p> <p>- Introduction The authors had made good revision.</p> <p>-Experimental The experimental part could bring the geographical coordinates for the plant collection.</p> <p>-Results According to the guidelines to the authors the results</p>	<p>I agree to this reviewer's corrections</p> <p>The comparison was done.</p> <p>This was done.</p> <p>The heading of the tables were placed before each table. The explanation was done in discussion to avoid repetition.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>should contain a brief text prior the tables.</p> <p>Tables: It must place a short text on each table related to the results.</p> <p>-References Standardize references.</p>	<p>The references were standardize according to the author's guideline of the journal.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		