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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript is valuable review for all people interested in studying antimicrobial activity of plant extracts.

I have some comments. Abstract - MIC should be explained in the body of abstract despite of abbreviations. I think that the method recommended by you is useful not only for the assessment of antifungal activity of natural compounds but also for antibacterial activity. It should be underlined in abstract. Key words : antimicrobial activity, plant extracts rather than antimicrobial resistance, extractant. Results - 3.1.3 Using resazurin as growth indicator will be better (similarly to other points), Figure 2 - description should be corrected. 3.1.4 and 3.1.5 should be combined, Line 24,25 should be deleted. Using ATP as growth indicator is described later (line 30, 31). Line 51 In EU countries EUCAST recommendations are obligatory. I think that you should mention it.

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

Unable to assess

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

Unable to assess

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

Yes

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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