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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor Comments:

Thank you for your revised submission. There are only some, very minor, formatting changes required for this manuscript before it can be accepted. We apologise however since these requests refer to funding/conflict of interest they must be completed by the author before acceptance.

Please address the following

1. Under the 'Competing Interest' declaration please replace the current text with a statement that the author, Dr. Eloff, is a member of the BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine Board as a Section Editor

Response

Change made

2. Under the 'Funding' declaration please state the role funding body had in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript. If the funding body played no such role, please also state this.

Response

Change made.
Once you have addressed these changes, and resubmitted, please email the Editor such that the resubmission can be handled as quickly as possible.

BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Dan Vodnar (Reviewer 1): The authors doesn't convincingly addressed the questions from the first review. The authors should carefully provide more informations ( as requested in the previous review report).

Response

(This is the reviewer who stated previously that the English in the manuscript is NOT SUITABLE FOR PUBLICATION UNLESS EXTENSIVELY EDITED. The English in his comments have many grammatical mistakes!!)

I have replaced the term “antimicrobial compound” with “antibiotic” and have added the following additional sentence to try to accommodate the reviewer who has worked on antimicrobial food supplements using agar diffusion methods.

“The aim of most papers investigating the antimicrobial activity of plant extracts is to find new antibiotics that would address the growing resistance against antibiotics.” This is right after the sentence I have previously added to also address his work done on food supplements.

“Some food supplements based on plant extracts do have some antimicrobial activity and have been commercialized, but the aim is not to yield new antibiotics.”

Anna Malm (Reviewer 2): I accept all the changes introduced by Author.

Response

Thank you.
Nurdan Saraç (Reviewer 3): no comments to author

Vassya Bankova  (Reviewer 4): This article is an important contribution to the field of antimicrobial studies of plant extracts. It is well-written, it is critical, detailed and exhaustive; it is also timely because so many articles appear in this field and the practical results are so slim. I believe that this article will help many researchers to improve their approach to the study of antimicrobial plant extracts.

Response

Thank you to the Editor for selecting this unbiased and knowledgeable reviewer. His/her well-reasoned response is very encouraging and is a vindication of the value of this manuscript.