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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

Specific comments of the reviewer are as follows:

1. Line 38- Replace ‘excitement’ with ‘relevance’.
2. Background/introduction appears to be lengthy and exhaustive. Authors have explained in detail about ‘herbal medicine’ with ancient overview and it seems to be unnecessary in this manuscript as it has been known for long time and can already get this information from other sources too (Lines 47-72). The facts and figures quoted here are old and do not offer anything new or current knowledge for the readers. It is better to modify/re-write these paragraphs, and present this part very brief. Another paragraph (Lines 73-88) also requires rewriting as it does not provide any new information. By this way a long list of references can be avoided in the manuscript. Further, it is suggested explaining the current knowledge on P. resinosa plant and its applications in health management, particularly in Kenya.
3. Define the abbreviations when they are first used in the manuscript.
4. Provide the Company name and place for the chemicals and reagents used. Follow the same for equipments too.
5. Line 254- Delete ‘according to’ and modify as ‘standard procedures as described previously [6, 28, 29].
6. In results/discussion section, the first two paragraphs (Lines 296-319) consist a general information and can be deleted completely. Another paragraph (Lines 320-334) must be re-written and retain only the sentences relevant to this study.
7. Please cite relevant references to the possible reasons explained for antimicrobial activity of plant extracts by different methods (Lines 344-356).
8. Cytotoxicity of the plant extracts should be better explained here (Lines 385-392) with relevant references. Moreover, re-write the sentences as they appear vague (Lines 388-392).
9. Line 392- Change ‘output’ to ‘outcome’.
10. Line 396,- Delete the sentence “For us they are the best……………….”.
11. The sentence (Lines 416-418) may perhaps be an overstatement and needs to be modified by keeping the results of this study in view.
12. Lines 421-425 can be deleted. Please summarize the findings and possible future directions of the present study in the end.

13. The manuscript must be rechecked for a few grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors.

14. Modify the titles of a few tables by including plant (P. resinosa) name. Avoid mentioning the word 'results' in title.

15. Please format the manuscript as per the journal's specifications.

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

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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