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Reviewer's report:

Having read the Authors corrected version am satisfied that they have amicably dealt with all the Revisions raised. I therefore obliged to recommend that the manuscript should be published with Minor revisions.

Minor Revisions

Backround
Line 2: .......people in rural and urban areas of the world were depended on the medicinal plants(DELETE "Were") should be people depended on.....

Line 3: ....deriving from plants....(replace deriving with derived)

Line 5: Delete this sentence since its incorrect or speculative...(compared with costly synthetic drugs that have adverse effects [1].)

Page 4: Extraction of plant material...correct degree symbol must be used not superscript digit zero(this should be maintained through out the manuscript)

Page 7: Antifungal Assay
PDA should be elaborated before abbreviation

Line 10: The experiment was repeated for three times(rephrase this was done in triplicate)

Line 12: average of three measurements(rephrase a triplicate of measurements...)

Page 8: Statistical Analysis
Line 3: Delete the word"such as" ....it lacks specificity and EXCEL isnt a statistical package

The authors should refer to my initial comments on this section which hasnt been well addressed.

Page 10: and p values of Herbal should read p(italics) of herbal(lower case)

General comment on tables and figures:

Each figure and table should be on an individual page, the figures generated can be improved by using CAD /Illustrative softwares than MS Excel
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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