

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 | |

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. | Theres a rising incidence of antibacterial resistance globally, and this has necessitated the continuous search for antibacterial compounds, even from plant sources. This manuscript explores the plant <i>Diospyros mespiliformis</i> for its antibacterial and cytotoxic properties. This plant seems to have a well-documented history in traditional medicine. The study aims the exploring this plant for cytotoxic and antibacterial properties while also establishing it safety for consumption. The manuscript further provides insights into the efficiency of various extracts. . | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes! | |
| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The abstract should include methodology used e.g. •The “disk diffusion and MIC” determination techniques.• The abstract does not highlight statistical significance or comparisons with standard antibiotics• Cytotoxicity findings could be better presented by including specific IC₅₀ values rather than just stating "very low toxicity."• The abstract should include a clear conclusion | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes, the scientific approach is robust and follows standard methodologies.• Could improve the manuscript by providing statistical analyses comparing extract activity with standard antibiotics (e.g., ANOVA, t-tests). | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Yes | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes | |
| Optional/General comments | As part of the conclusion, propose future possible direction for example Fractionation and compound identification to isolate active compounds | |

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Name: | Umar Itopa Sheriff |
| Department, University & Country | Morgan State University, USA |