

# Review of: "Phytochemical Contents, GC-MS Analysis and Hepatoprotective Effect of the Methanol Leaf Extract of *Camelliasinensis* (L.) Kuntze on Paracetamol-Induced Liver Injury in Wistar Rats"

Rayran Walter Ramos de Sousa<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Federal University of Piauí

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear editor, to be accepted, the article needs to undergo further revisions. There are inconsistencies in the results and statistical analyses to actually prove that the sample under study presents the effect being investigated.

Below are some considerations:

1. "It is sedative, anticarcinogenic, anti-bacterial, anti-diabetic, anti-tumor, and antiviral" –**please add study references;**
2. "This family is unique because of its numerous uses as antioxidants, anticancer, antidiabetic, and analgesic" –**add study references;**
3. "The qualitative phytochemical screening was carried out on the extracts using standard procedures to identify major constituents such as alkaloids, flavonoids, tannins, terpenoids, saponins, anthraquinones, cardiac glycosides, sterols, and phytosterols." – **What methods were used for these qualitative identifications? Provide a succinct description;**
4. **There is no ethics committee. Where were the animals kept? Indicate the institution and number of the ethics committee. What euthanasia method was used?**
5. **Which vehicle was used to prepare the extract samples?**
6. **How did the treatment with the CSE extract occur: after induction with PCM, and how long after? Or was it a pre-treatment? Detail this induction and treatment protocol in more detail;**
7. "The liver function markers such as ast (aspartate amino transaminase), alt (alanine amino transaminase), alp (alkaline phosphatase), tc (total cholesterol), alb (albumin), sbl (serum bilirubin), tp (total proteins), creatinine and biochemical parameters were evaluated." **All markers indicated are biochemical parameters. I suggest removing the "and biochemical parameters were evaluated.";**
8. **The electrolyte dosage (indicated in table 4 as a result) was not informed in the methodology;**
9. **Replace the Roman numerals in table 5 with the respective group names. Standardize across all subsequent tables and data;**
10. **The results were compared only with the negative control and not with the induced group. How can we infer whether the extract was promising if the comparison is wrong? The data must focus on group II (disease control). Another comparison must be made between the normal control and the disease control to ascertain**

**whether the induction model worked adequately;**

- 11. Histopathological analysis does not allow us to infer anything from what has been said. The images are of poor quality, and the indications in the figures do not match the standards of scientific articles.**