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Respected Authors,
Respected Editor

Suggestion related to manuscript
Page 4, Line 54
Change Subtitle GC/MS analysis of the EO
To
GC/FID and GC/MS analysis of the EO
Reason: Since Authors performed GC/FID (for semiquantitative and identification) and GC/MS (identification) analysis, it will be better that this subtitle is named GC/FID and GC/MS analysis of the EO

Page 5, first paragraph, lines 4-21
Authors (exactly first Author as corresponding author, previously used same chromatographic conditions for GC/FID and GC/MS analysis, so my suggestion is that Authors must cited this paper (below is reference)

In Experimental Parts Antifungal activities and Antibacterial activities Authors must listed tested microorganisms in alphabetic order.

In Experimental Part authors first mentioned procedure for Antifungal activity, and after that experimental procedure for antibacterial activity. But in part Results and Discussion is opposite situation. Authors first discuss results of antibacterial activity, and after that results of antifungal activity. For this situation, my suggestion is that authors change order in Experimental part, exactly to write first procedure for antibacterial activity.

Some comments to Table 1 and Table 2

Authors must correct Tables 1 and 2

In both Tables- b: Identification of the essential oil components was performed by comparison of mass spectra and RIs obtained in both columns with those of reference compounds and those of mass spectra libraries. I do not understand this. In both tables b was reserved for percentage of individual constituents.

Also, in both Tables Authors must write percentage of individual constituents at the first decimal. Also, same in the text of manuscript.

For Table 3,

Authors must write bacterial strains in alphabetical order.

For Table 3 in the title of table correct mg/ml to mg/mL

For Table 3 and Table 4

Authors mentioned in experimental part - statistical analysis , that values of biological activities are mean ± standard deviation (SD). For clarity of presentation, in both Tables it must be mentioned. E.g. values are given as mean ± standard deviation (SD).
Table 5 must be corrected
Correct mg/ml to mg/mL,
It is not necessary to write full name of DPPH- delete 2,2’-diphenylicrylhydrazyl
Correct in Table 5 DPPH to DPPH assay
Correct in Table 5 β-Carotene-linoleic acid to β-Carotene-linoleic acid assay

Part Conclusion
I do not understand sentence ‘‘ Additionally, the activity of tested EOs was lower than that of
the standard BHA used. ‘‘ For DPPH antiradical activity Authors used BHT, not butylated
hydroxyanisole BHA. Authors must correct this also in part Abstract, subpart conclusion.
Except conclusions related to chemical compositions of oils, as well as examined activities,
Authors must write what was their goal of this research. In part Abstract, subpart conclusion was
on nice sentence … and can be used as an agrochemical for controlling plant pathogens and in
human disease management

In overall, my opinion is that after necessary corrections (since this manuscripts gives new
findings and results), may be accepted for publication.

Best regards

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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