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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
R/. I consider that the authors defined very well the objectives of the paper

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
R/. The methods used in this paper are appropriated to reach the objective of the paper. However, I consider that in order to give more strength to the paper, it will be important to get the phytochemical screening from the methanolic extracts.

3. Are the data sound?
R/. The authors used several control concentrations in the different assays; however, they did not give the standard deviations. In my opinion it will be better to use the IC50 parameter for each one of the antioxidant determinations.

The results of the antimicrobial activity are consistent with the experimental method used.

It is suggested that the term significantly, should be exchanged, since it does not have a definite mean.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
R/. All procedures used in the experimental work adhere to standards for reporting data, and they used reference substances.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
R/. In my opinion, the authors are short in discussion, and they would get a better result analysis; in addition, the conclusions are weak and by should be reforced.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
R/. There is no evidence of work limitations by the authors, and from the document is very difficult to deduce such point.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

R/. The authors acknowledge their results and support their findings partially with published data. They also gave credits to authors that they used in the document.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

R/. The title and abstract are accurately adjusted to the results found by the authors.

9. Is the writing acceptable?

R/. The writing style in the manuscript is acceptable; however, there are several corrections along the document that should be taken in order to get the manuscript published. Therefore, I strongly suggested that the authors correct the manuscript according to the comments to the document.

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The authors should adjust the writing stile; modify the discussion and references according to the journal description; in addition, it is suggested to eliminate several old references, which can be substituted for newer ones.

Quality of written English

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

- Acceptable. The manuscript should be corrected, according to the suggestion accounting on the document.

Algunas correcciones se encuentran en el manuscripto que se adjunta.

**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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