Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_131022
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of antibacterial activity and cytotoxicity of leaf extracts from the plant Diospyros Mespiliformis
Type of the Article	Original research paper

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The antibacterial and cytotoxic properties of several organic extractives of <i>Diospyros mespiliformis</i> leaves are highlighted in this study. The extracts brought out a brawny safety profile by successfully inhibiting clinically relevant pathogens, including <i>P. aeruginosa, E. faecalis</i> , and <i>S. aureus</i> , while demonstrating low damning effects towards different categories of hepatocytic cell lines. Moreover, the identification of minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of the plant extracts is momentous. In the era of antibiotic resistance, these findings could lead to a new approach to antibiotic treatment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The context is appropriate for the title. Additionally, it may have a catchier title like "Exploring the Antimicrobial and Cytotoxic Properties of different Organic Extractives of Diospyros mespiliformis Leaves: Prospects for Future Wound Care"	
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.	Although the abstract of this article is comprehensive, it requires further refinement. It is inevitable to make goals and relevance clear in the context of drug discovery, antimicrobial resistance and cytotoxicity studies. The authors should mention whether the results are statistically significant or not.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Indeed, the references are adequate and current.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Despite being appropriate for scholarly communications, the article's language and English quality might be enhanced by using excellent academic writing practices.	
Optional/General comments	The authors should go into more depth to highlight the study's distinctiveness.	

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 3 (07-07-2024)

Review Form 3

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	H. M. Shadid Hossain Snigdha
Department, University & Country	Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Science and Technology University, Bangladesh

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 3 (07-07-2024)