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Reviewer’s report:

Minor Essential Revisions

Title: Antimicrobial activity of selected South African medicinal plants.

1. The manuscript is overall well written and data is presented in tabular form.
2. Line 3. Author’s name: You should write Lall3** instead of Lall3*

Abstract section:

4. Line 33. Delete ‘;’. Use instead ‘and’.

Background section:

5. Line 61, precise the criteria of choosing the tested plants.
6. The last sentence of the background should be deleted. ‘The study was carried out on a panel of microorganisms including fungi, mycobacteria and resistant Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacterial species’.
7. Authors should give much background on antimicrobial activity of selected plants.

Materials and methods section:

8. Line 70 write materials instead of material.
10. Line 103, the word ‘determinations’ should be deleted.
11. Line 117, the year 1996 should be also deleted.
12. Lines 148 and 149, it’s 1x102 and 14CO2 instead of 1x102 and 14CO2.

Results and discussion section:

13. Line 179, it’s ‘determinations’ instead of ‘determinations’
14. Authors should compare antimicrobial activities of their extracts with those of the literature for the same plants.
15. Line 222, delete ‘;’ after TRH and VK wrote the manuscript.
References are not in the correct format.

Major Compulsory Revisions

16. In MIC determinations, only six extracts were tested against M. tuberculosis, meanwhile in MMC determinations twenty extracts were tested on the same microorganism. How can you explain this?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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