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From

Waheeta Hopper,
Corresponding author (MS: 1863145134292102),
SRM University

To

The chief editor,
Complementary and Alternative Medicine
Bio Med Central

Sub: Submission of revised manuscript (MS: 1863145134292102) with response to the reviewer comments.

Dear editor,

I Waheeta Hopper corresponding author for the manuscript entitled “Antibacterial activity of Artemisia nilagirica leaf extracts against clinical and phytopathogenic bacteria” (MS: 1863145134292102) would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable comments. After going through the manuscript systematically, the following major changes have been made. A) Antibacterial information of various Artemisia sp. was commented. B) Brief information of phytochemical screening was included in material and methods section. C) The results and discussion were re-formatted and the conjunctive information of susceptibility test, MIC and phytochemical screening were discussed in detail. We further clarified several issues raised by the reviewer. Kindly find a summary, below of how we responded to the comments.

Thanking you,

Regards,

Waheeta Hopper
Reviewer: 1

Comment 1: Concerning antimicrobial activity, the comparison to works published by other groups with species belonging to Artemisia such as, A. Princeps, A. fragrans, A. absinthium, A. feddei, A. dracunculus, A. santonicum, and A. spicigera, should be commented.

Response: Thanks for the referee suggestion. We now included the necessary information of the previous *Artemisia* work in the background section of the manuscript.

Comment 2: In the abstract, the authors suggested that terpenoids and flavonoids had more activity in plant pathogen. There is no experimental data to support their suggestion.

Response: We agree to the referee, we wrongly indicate terpenoids and flavonoids had more activity in phytopathogens. But, now the changes were made in abstract.

Comment 3: In table 3, diethyl ether extract was shown to contain not so much flavonoids as those from chloroform or ethanol extract, it had comparable amount of activity to phytopathogens. How can the authors explain this?

Response: The diethyl ether extract shown positive for the flavonoids but, the presents of flavonoids were not in abundance. In contrast the presence of terpenoids in the diethyl ether extract was abundant. In the work published by other groups on the same species they have identified the terpenoids in the extract has a more activity against pathogens [1-3], may be the presence of terpenoids is a major reason for the activity in phytopathogens in comparison to chloroform and ethanol extract of same plant.


**Comment 4:** In table 1, positive controls are needed from phytopathogens. Without them, nobody can conclude the effectiveness and the reliability of the activity.

**Response:** The positive controls for phytopathogens were added to the table 1.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Comment 5:** I recommend the authors to check English grammar and typos again.

**Response:** The grammar and typos error has been checked and corrected.
Reviewer: 2

Comment 1: The phytochemical analysis should be described briefly.

Response: Thanks for the referee suggestion. The necessary information about phytochemical analysis was now added in materials and methods section.

-----------------------------------------------

Comment 2: At the results and discussion the authors should try better to comment their work, as concern the antibacterial activity of the organic extracts in conjunction with the determined compounds. The discussion must be supported by their findings according Table 3.

Response: Thanks for the referee comment. The results and discussion of the manuscript was re-formatted and the conjunctive information of susceptibility test [Table. 1], MIC [Table. 2] and phytochemical screening [Table. 3], were discussed in detail.

-----------------------------------------------