# Review of: "Efficacy of Anogeissus leiocarpus as a Therapeutic Agent for Some Pathogenic Bacteria"

Floricéa Araújo[1]

1 Universidade Federal da Bahia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Fred Coolborn Akharaiyi and other authors,

When analyzing the article “Efficacy of Anogeissus leiocarpus as a Therapeutic Agent for Some Pathogenic Bacteria,” I considered it very important to disseminate knowledge about Anogeissus leiocarpus. However, as a reviewer, I will highlight some points that I consider essential to make your article a good reference source.

In the introduction, I suggest: i) highlighting or specifying whether there are already reports of chemical studies and microbiological activities for the species, genus, and/or family, that is, the originality of this research, or even the importance of revisiting Anogeissus leiocarpus, if applicable.

ii) How widespread is the species on the planet, or where can we commonly find it?

In the methodology, I leave some reflections and suggestions for adjustments: i) in the quantification of saponins and alkaloids with re-extraction, followed by weighing the mass of the final residue, do you believe it is reliable? Reviewing a more up-to-date methodological reference is necessary since I found that you cited an article from 1974.

ii) The determination of steroids and glycosides, as described in the article, does not appear to be a quantitative analysis method since it only mentions the color change as an indication of the presence of metabolites. How did you determine the quantity shown in Table 1?

iii) What does (- 15±0.16 mg/100g) mean in the quantification of glycosides in the aqueous extract?

In the results section, I make some suggestions for textual adjustments (formatting) and present the positive points of your work:

i) Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 have the formatting of the columns merged; I suggest you present them with their respective columns and rows to make it easier to consult them.

ii) In the running text for lipid and nitrogen contents, the unit of measurement must be presented; the same must be done for the antioxidant tests, “Values of 0.56±0.60, 1.18±0.11, and 1.76±1.3 were recorded for HRS, FRAP, and FRAS respectively in the ethanol extract, while it was 7.3±0.4, 1.24±0.2, and 1.61±0.1 for HRS, FRAP, and FRAS respectively in the aqueous extract.”

The discussion item provides a good explanation of the data obtained. Still, it is essential to establish the relationship between metabolites, microbiological and antioxidant activities, and the population's traditional use of the species.