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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? no
3. Are the data sound? no
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? no
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished: not of purpose
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? yes

Please make your review as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find and please also divide your comments into the following categories:

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Comments of the paper: Justification for the use of Ocimum gratissimum in herbal medicines and its interaction with discs antibiotics.

The aim of the work looks nice but the achievement of the publication needed profound revisions.

P4 The taxonomist name has to follow the botanical name of the plant. What about the voucher specimen? The name of the people who identified the plant has to be added.
P4: the conditions of obtention of the extract has to be more precise: The concentration at room temperature should take several days. What about the steril conditions? Furthermore the yield of extract has to be given. This extract of leaves contains an important amount of the lipophylic chlorophylle. Is this metabolite not disturbing the experiments?

P4: the origine of the clinical isolates has to be indicated and it should be precised if these strains develops resistance to conventional antibiotics or not.

P6: in the explanation of the antibacterial test, the expression of the results have to be given: I suppose that after incubation, the inhibition zone diameters were measured. The authors doesn’t mention the number of replicates and that the values are means of x replicates. Furthermore, the data of the negative control (DMSO) and the positive control (antibiotic) have to be given. The significance of the results is absolutely absent from the manuscript.

P7: the authors have written: This is statistically significant (p<0.05 but never they explain how they calculate this p<0.05.

P8: the results of the phytochemical screening is quite contradictory with some results of the literature. Furthermore spelling mistakes: anthroquinones --> anthraquinones; steriodal ---> steroidal

P9: table 2: in the legende the number of replicates has to be indicated. To interpretate this table, negative and positive control have to be added.

P10: and p11: the tables 3 and 4 have to be deleted because all the data are included in table 5.

P13: second column and third column (in the case of C. abicans ATCCC9025): 38 30 and the authors concluded to additive!!!!! No it is the contrary. Or may be there is some error in the data of the first column. In the legende the units should be written properly mg and not mcg.

P14: The authors are speaking of the MICs; they should speak on this before the discussion.

In all the discussion, the antagonism or synergistic effect should be supported by significance of the results.

P17: « interaction of the leaves of the plant with the antibiotics..... »-------> interaction of the leaves extract of the plant with the antibiotics.....

Possible in corporation in chemotherapy: this sentence has to be revised.