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Discretionary Revisions

1. Abstract
   In “Conclusions”: I recommend you to put “The study revealed in vitro antibacterial activity…”

2. Results
   Paragraph 1
   I think that it is better to put:
   “The extracts were active against C. albicans, E. faecalis and S. aureus at a concentration between 128 and 512 µg/mL. Guizotia schimperi, L. adoensis var. adoensis and P. schimperi showed activity against E. faecalis and S. aureus (MIC ranged from 128 to 512 µg/mL), whereas…”
   “Candida albicans was susceptible to G. schimperi and L. adoensis var. adoensis at highest concentrations only (MIC = 512 µg/ml). Gram-negative bacteria (E. coli and P. aeruginosa) were resistant to all ethanol extracts tested in this study.

3. Table 1
   Please, standardize the format (e.g. In “No 2” in “Voucher no.” At-176)
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