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Reviewer's report:

The present article is exactly similar to the article published in BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicines “Antimicrobial activities of pomegranate rind extracts: enhancement by addition of metal salts and vitamin C”

Well both the papers (One published and the one which has come for evaluation) are from the same group. The published article is against 5 microbial strains which are identified while the present article is against clinical isolates of S. aureus, MRSA and PVL positive CA-MSSA

Except the first paragraph, the entire introduction is exactly same as the published article including the same references.

The references are directly picked from the published work, along with the mistakes in the printed version. For example reference number 12. Braga et al. J Ethnopharmacol 2005, 96-355-339. This is same in published paper.

Page 3, line no. 15 the quoted reference No.9 and in methods page 5 line no. 7 the reference No. 19, both are same. Now you see in the published article in methods the reference quoted in 19. But this 19 refers to Stewart et al. 1998 while in the present paper Reference 19 refers to Mathabe et al. 2006. Explain

Page 4 line 17 – Gram negative laboratory strain of bacteria – explain

Page 4 line 23 – PRE/metal ions – PRE and metal ion slash means or not and

Page 4 line 24 stabilizing agent – which?

Page 5 line No. 18 isolates were passed twice on nutrient agar – Please state the specificity and provide the reference for the same

Page 5 line No. 18- Give reference for inocula preparation

Page 5 line 23 – Antibiotic sensitivity testing – Antibiotics were procured from which source give details.

Also check the spelling of meticillin in entire document and check the spelling of gentamcin
Page 6 line 6 – Antimicrobial activity of PRE with the addition of metal salts – metal salts is wrong it should have been cupric salt

Page 6 – line 12 – metal salts (FeSO4, CuSO4)- FeSO4 is wrong

Page 6 line 18 – Lambda buffer – give details of composition or make

Page 7 line 1 – metal salts should have been cupric salt

Page 7 line 1, 2, and 3 not clear about the concentrations.

Page 7 line 5 – MIC determination of PRE and CuSo4 – no reference is cited for the method

Page 7 line 7 - in a concentration of 800 mg/ml . I think there is some error

Page 7 line 7 – The description of the plates is not mentioned properly.

Page 7 line 8 – what is the make of Iso-Sensitest broth ? Please mention

Page 7 - How MIC is calculated ? No standard reference is given

Page 7 – line 20 – PRE/CuSO4 combination - What does this means PRE and CuSO4 or do you mean PRE or CuSO4. The use of slash is wrong here.

Page 7 – line 23 – wrong English

Page 8 line 5 – resistant to four of the eight antibiotics tested

Page 8 line 8 – addition of metal salts – it should have been addition of cupric salt

Page 8 – English has to be improved. Use of negating (line 14) and negates (line 22) is not proper

Page 9 – line 7 –again the use of metal salts is wrong and why data is not shown for this work?

Page 9 line 16 – it should have been Table 2 – not Table 1 .

The results are not properly discussed.

Page 9 – line 22 – discussion part – badly written.

Page 10 line 16 – blank sample – What is blank sample?

The use of metal salts, PRE/CuSO4, is wrongly done in the entire manuscript and it becomes very difficult to understand what the author wants to say.

Now for references section – Most badly and carelessly written section.

There are 24 references out of which 13 references are quoted from Reference No. 18
No 9. and No. 19 are same references though 2 different numbers are given.

So in all only 10 new references are added.

The references are directly picked up from the article (Ref. No. 18) and their number are quoted which are not applicable to the present manuscript. This puts doubt on how correct the quoted references are.

Ref. No. 10 – Phytomedicine – it should have been Phytomed

Ref. No. 11 – Int J Antimicrobl Agent – it should have been Int J Antimicrob Agents

Ref. No. 12 – page No. wrong

Ref. No. 18. Journal name wrongly quoted

Ref. No. 24. Journal name wrong and page no. wrongly quoted

Over all comments:

The question posed by the author is not well defined.

The methods are appropriate but not well described.

The figures are not explained properly. They are not self explanatory

Use of metal salts and in one place FeSO4 is also included instead of cupric salt shows the carelessness of the author.

Most of the introduction and discussion is repetitive of the previous work.

The quoted references are wrong in some of the places.

The results obtained are moderate.

Overall it is not to the high standard of the journal (in my opinion) hence it is rejected on the basis it is scientifically not sound, but the editor can take the final decision.