



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_46227
Title of the Manuscript:	Antimicrobial Assay of aqueous extracts of selected Ethno-pharmacologic alternatives used by the Maasai community of Narok, Kenya
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Line 17: “plants were .....” – I suggest this be moved to introduction.</b></p> <p><b>Line 32: I suggest that this should be – The result obtained is a good rationale for utilization .....</b></p> <p><b>Line 34: You may add the word “phytochemicals” should be added to the keywords as study included such.</b></p> <p><b>Line 51: rely NOT “relies”</b></p> <p><b>Lines 59-66: Consider taking these to Materials and Methods</b></p> <p><b>Line 71: Consider using – Based on recent reports .....</b></p> <p><b>Line 74:Also herbal “infusion”? did you mean concoction?. rationalized NOT “rationalize”</b></p> <p><b>Lines 71 - 75: I suggest that these should be placed under a sub-topic “ 2.2 Plants Identification and Rationalization” and briefly state how this was done.</b></p> <p><b>Line 77: If you accept the suggested 2.2, then this line becomes 2.3 and so on ....</b></p> <p><b>Line 105: Should be 6 maleS</b></p> <p><b>Lines 152 - 153: Consider moving this to Methods while from “and the percentage .....” should remain under Plant samples and extractions. You may start with – The percentage plant yield was .....</b></p> <p><b>Line 227: rationale NOT rationaleS “</b></p>	<p>The Authors accept the suggestion and the sentence re-written to Line 16</p> <p>The suggestion is accepted and correction adopted as in line 31</p> <p>The word ‘phytochemicals’ has been added to key words as in line 33</p> <p>Corrected to ‘rely’ in line 50</p> <p>The paragraph has been re-written to stand as the ‘Conclusion remark’ of the Introduction section as is in line 56 -62</p> <p>Corrected to ‘Based on ....’ As in line 67</p> <p>Corrections made to ‘concoction’ and ‘rationalized’ as is in line 70</p> <p>This has be re-written in line 64 – 72. Section 2.1 is a key components of the materials and Methods that particularly gives a background and basis for the study design and site hence the authors consider it being appropriate in section 2.1</p> <p>Section remains</p> <p>Corrected to ‘males’ in line 102</p> <p>This has been moved to Methods as line 110 – 111 And adjustments done as recommended in the line 151</p> <p>Corrected as in line 222</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>Consider reading through each paragraph of the results and discussion. There are statements that would have been pushed to the materials and methods.</p> <p>The conclusion also sounds like a discussion. Just give your final discovery</p>	<p>Each paragraph was read through and the following adjustments made in the Results &amp; Discussion section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Line 174 revised</li> <li>- Line 174 corrected</li> <li>- Lines 200 – 202 pushed to Materials and Methods Section now as line 137 – 139</li> </ul> <p>The conclusion slightly rephrased to introduce the discoveries before citing</p>
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manuscript topic is apt - Relevant and timely.</li> <li>• It was based on rigorous academic standards with sound methodology</li> <li>• Very interesting subject from the research domicile</li> </ul>	

**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>	There are no ethical issues in the study /manuscript