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Results and discussion

Anti-proliferative effect in M. tuberculosis cannot be inferred thought the plant effect in placenta expulsion, since this may have more be related to smooth muscle contraction or induced apoptosis. Anti-proliferative mechanisms in eukaryotes are quite different from prokaryotes, so, this explanation in out of line.

Another possibility of the lack of activity of G. coulteri may be it's used in combination with other plant infusion in the sick patient, since combination of herb remedies are often used rather than one alone. So scientific confirmation of the biological activity may be biased by the inability of reproduce the actual practical use of the plant or plants, in a given pathological condition.

Authors refer that they used the Blajet test to establish possible presence of SQL and then indicate table 3, but they do not indicate what they find out. The part "...to establish the possible presence of these molecules that resulted positive for all our different extract of..." it is not clear.

The test confirmed the presence of SQL in all the A. confertiflora extracts? It did not? It is not clear in the paper. For what you reply to the comment in the cover letter, you find that the SQL are present in all the extracts tested, so please review the writing in the paper about this point.

Finally I have respectful to insist, that the findings suggest that the infusion method used to extract the active compounds in traditionally medicine is not the best method, since the active compounds at least for this disease (tuberculosis), are less or even non-polar, and this finding is very important and should be clearly stated in discussion or in conclusions.
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