Gene, Cell and Tissue
Volume 9 · Issue 1 · e115133

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Investigation of Antimicrobial Activity of Medicinal Plant Extracts on *Bacillus cereus* Isolated from Soil

Bahman Fazeli-Nasab, Laleh Shahraki-Mojahed, Mohammad Amir Hassanzadeh, Fatemeh Bidarnamani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
17 Apr 2021	2 May 2021	23 May 2021	10.5812/gct.115133

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3

Authors' reply to reviewers 4

Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

3 comments · 25 Apr 2021 – 26 Apr 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 25 Apr 2021

Dear Authors,

1-First, explain why you did not use the standard strain of Bacillus cereus in your study.

2-How can you be sure that the medicinal plant extract you studied has no short- or long-term side effects? Did you follow up with the patients? Explain.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 26 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting the manuscript entitled “Investigation of antimicrobial activity of medicinal plant extracts on Bacillus cereus isolated from soil ” to Gene, Cell and Tissue Journal.
The review process is now complete, and all thorough reviews are included. The reviewers also identified some concerns. Generally, there are some points concerning material and methods, discussion, and also writing and grammar in this manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewers' comments and revise your manuscript. Please document and highlight any revisions and be sure to respond in a point-by-point fashion.
sincerely,

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 26 Apr 2021

Based on the reviewers' comments and my reading of the manuscript, major revisions and a point-by-point response to the comments are needed.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear editor in chief of Gene, Cell, Tissue

Thanks for everything

The article was revised based on the reviewer's comments and below information and also the revised texts were highlighted by yellow color.

You can find the response of the reviewers comment at the bottom this letter

Best

Authors

2021-04-27

Reviewer 1:

1-explain why you did not use the standard strain of Bacillus cereus in your study first.

Standard bacteria were used. But this part of the experiment failed, so the authors tried to remove this part because they did not have enough confidence in the data. On the other hand, they could not retest the standard bacteria because in that case, too, the conditions of the experiment were different and the result could not have the necessary dependence.

2-how you are sure there is no side effect for your medicinal plant extract which you have studied in short/long times did you check up the patients. Explain.

The article was thoroughly reviewed and it was found that in this article, wherever the side effects are discussed, only chemical drugs are mentioned and no plant extracts are mentioned at all. However, some sources state that the side effects of plant extracts are less than chemical drugs, which is natural. Because in everyday life, people consume the same medicinal plants, and if they had many side effects, they certainly would not consume them.

Reviewer 2:

In addition to bacteriological methods, Bacillus species must be approved by molecular methods.

We completely agree with the respected reviewer of the article that in order to identify the bacteria, the results will be completely more reliable if the molecular part is also done. But due to sanctions and lack of proper financial support for the projects, unfortunately, we have not been able to do this. Otherwise, the authors are fully aware of the subject and agree with the opinion of the esteemed reviewer

It is better to mention the strengths and weaknesses of the study in the discussion section.

This section was reviewed and edited. Of course, according to the journal policy based on the total number of words in the article (maximum 3500 words), the journal policy was tried to be observed.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 21 May 2021 – 23 May 2021

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 21 May 2021

Dear Author,
I am grateful to you for considering submitting the manuscript entitled " Investigation of antimicrobial activity of medicinal plant extracts on Bacillus cereus isolated from soil" to Gene, Cell and Tissue. All the comments on this manuscript have been taken into account and this version is suitable for publication.
Sincerely,

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 23 May 2021

Based on the reviewer's and AE's comments, the revisions were done well. Thus, this manuscript can be accepted for publication in GCT.