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November 17, 2010

The Editor-in-Chief,

BMC Complementary and Alternative Therapy,

Dear Sir,

**Submission of corrected manuscript**

We the authors of the manuscript entitled “Evaluation of the antibacterial and anticancer activities of some South African medicinal plants” wish to express our gratitude for the constructive review comments on our manuscript and wish to submit the corrected version of the manuscript to your journal for review and publication.

All experiments were conducted based on standard and established procedures. Data are accurate and all assertions are based on carefully researched information by the author(s).

This manuscript has never been published in total or in part elsewhere.

All authors named have participated in the work in a substantive way and are prepared to take public responsibility for the work. The present study was performed according to international, national and institutional rules considering, clinical studies and biodiversity rights.

Review comments and the highlighted responses are shown overleaf.

We look forward to your positive response.

Yours sincerely,

Mary A BISI-JOHNSON
Corresponding author
Response to: Reviewer 1

Major Comment

The broader title has been modified to reflect also anticancer activity

Minor comments

Introduction: There are few grammatical errors and in third paragraph few sentence are not complete.
Some amendments made to introduction lines 5, 19, 20

Methods: There is need to provide the details of strains, cancer cell lines and other material used in the method section.
The details of the bacterial strains used were mentioned in lines 3 and 4 of section 2.2
The details of the cancer cell lines were mentioned in line 2 section 2.3

For antibacterial activity Broth dilution method has been used by the method of Eloff (1998), why author has used the nutrient agar plate...Please Clarify?
There was no use or mention of nutrient agar plate but rather 96-well microtitre plate and the growth medium used in this case is Mueller Hinton Broth.

Author has mentioned that cells were maintained in DMSO (Is this Correct ?). Actually DMSO is inhibitory for most of the cell lines.
The preservative medium has been addressed

Why author used berberine as positive control? Is there any rationale?

Results and discussion
Author has mentioned that E. autumnalis was significantly stronger than berberine. Is this point correct? if yes then author should show this significance in table.

Statement reframed

There is need to discuss cytotoxicity data in details.
Discussed in section 3.2 while the remaining cytotoxicity data are as shown in table 2 to avoid repetition

References: Too many references and should be cut short.
References have been reduced
Minor Essential Revisions
1. Section 2.3, paragraph 2, line 1-2: it should read 1x10^4 per ml and not per cell.
   \textcolor{red}{Correction effected}
2. The last line on pg 6 should read ..........., was (not were) dissolved with 100 ul MTT stp...
   \textcolor{red}{Correction effected}
3. Under the Results section: Section 3.1, sentence No. 2. Delete the last two words (were observed) before reference [29].
   \textcolor{red}{Correction effected}
4. Under Discussion: the MICs indicated in the first sentence of the first sentence of paragraph No. 2 are not the same as those indicated in Figure 1. The values are 10 times lower.
   \textcolor{red}{Values in text were due to typographical error and have been amended according to the correct values in the figure.}
5. Conclusions: I suggest deletion of the second and 3rd sentences of the conclusion. The second sentence is more anecdotal than a rational conclusion from the results. The third sentence is again more of a speculation than evidence based selective anticancer activity. Only one cell line was used. Alos consider re-wording sentence No. 4.
   \textcolor{red}{Correction effected}
6. On the references list: Delete Journal Issue numbers for references No. 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18(and Feb), and 25.
   \textcolor{red}{Correction effected} and due to cutting down on references numbers 4=3, 5=4, 8=4, 11=7, 12=8, 15=10, 17=12, 18=13, 25=19