Dear Editor, Dear Tom,

Thanks for sending the reviewer’s recommendations for the above manuscript. We are now resubmitting the revised version taking in account their recommendations to improve it. The revision made are highlighted in recolor color in the manuscript and also listed point-by-point below.

I hope you will found the work suitable for publication now

best regards

(Prof. Dr. Victor Kuete)

Reviewer#1: William Schwan
The manuscript by Tankeo et al has shown significant improvement. However, there are several major revisions that need to be addressed.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Report any MIC values above 256 as > 256 ug/ml. The reality is that you will not get a lead compound with an MIC low enough to spark interest that is above 256 ug/ml.
   
   Answer: This has been done. as consequence Table with MBC values was deleted. We have now supplied previous MIC and MBC values as supporting information TableS1 and S2.

2. There remain issues with the writing.
   Answer: The manuscript was rechecked are corrected

3. On p. 9, the authors now talk about low cytotoxicity and cite their recent 2014
paper. However, the six plants discussed in that 2014 paper are not the same plants studied in this paper. A simple way to gauge crude cytotoxicity is to do two-fold serial dilutions of the extracts and spot on sheep blood agar plates. Lysis indicates cytotoxicity.  
Answer: To avoid confusions, reference to the cytotoxicity were removed. However, we do not have facilities to perform toxicity assays at the moment. the toxicity study has been suggested as perspective in the conclusion

Minor Essential Revisions
1. On p. 7, line 151, you have listed the CM64 strain. You should state Enterobacter aerogenes strains ATCC 13048 and CM64 to clarify.
2. Line 81 should be changed as well. Urogenital and pulmonary infections are infectious diseases..

Answer: The minor issues were corrected

Reviewer#2: Prasanta K. Bag
Reviewer's report:

The authors have corrected/justified most of the comments made by this reviewer. However, I have yet the following comments, which should be corrected/demostrated.

Comments:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. Lines 208-210. “The overall activity of the tested extracts could also be considered as interresting as a previous study highlighted the low cytotoxicity of extracts from Polyscias fulva as well as from Beilschmiedia acuta on normal AML12 hepatocytes [10].”
Since the preparation of extracts will differe from one study to other, the present study must demonstrate the cytotoxicity test of these plants extract on some normal cells. Reference is not sufficient.

Answer: As we mentioned above we do not have facilities to perform toxicity assays at the moment. the toxicity study has been suggested as perspective in the conclusion

Minor Essential Revisions:
2. Abstract, methods, “--the the minimum bactericidal---.”and “association with the of the most active ones--.” Should be corrected.
3. Line 174-175. “Various classes of phytochemicals were previously detected in the extracts of the four tested plants [10] and this may explain their antibacterial activity.” At least some compounds/phytochemicals’ name found in these plants must be indicated here, which are associated with the antimicrobial activity. Or please refer the Table where the presence of phytochemicals in these plants have been indicated (Change also the Table number following their appearance in the text.

Answer: Appropriate corrections were made. We have referred to Table2 where for the presence of Phytochemicals as recommended.

4. Line 190. “---the genus Beilschmiedia has previous been documented---.” ‘previous’ should be replaced with ‘previously’.

Answer: thanks, this has been done

5. Line 210-211. “In addition, these extracts also displayed the good anticancer effects on several cancer cell lines [10].” This line should be deleted.

Answer: It has been deleted

6. Lines 89-91. “The plants were identified at the National Herbarium (Yaounde, Cameroon), where voucher specimens were deposited under the reference numbers (Table 1).” However, these are shown in Table 2. Please correct it and change the order of Tables as referred in the text.

Answer: Tables1 and 2 were re-ordered according to their appearance in the text.

7. In the text, Table 2 has not been cited. Please correct it.

Answer: Table 2 has been cited in Line 106