

Review of: "Toxicological evaluation of aqueous extracts of *Clematis hirsuta* and *Rhamnus prinoides*"

Swastika Das¹

¹ B.L.D.E.A's Dr P.G.H. College of Engineering and Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear editor, first I thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript titled "Toxicological evaluation of aqueous extracts of *Clematis hirsuta* and *Rhamnus prinoides*".

The work is good with toxicological evaluation of two aqueous extracts (*Clematis hirsuta* leaves and *Rhamnus prinoides* roots) and of course, toxicological studies are important. I have the following points which the authors can consider for further work before publication. The manuscript needs major revision.

1. The abstract must be rewritten emphasizing the novelty of the work and the interesting findings.
2. The methodology section must be elaborated regarding preparation of plant extract, making of groups of animals, the hematological and biochemical studies in detail with equipment's / instrument's brand and model number. How are the doses decided? How many times the extracts were fed to the rats in a day is not clear.
3. The LD₅₀ values are not clear. Whether it is >2000mg or >225 mg (section 3.1.4 and section 3.2). How the LD₅₀ values are evaluated- whether for the whole extracts or for the components of the extracts. This is an important parameter, needs discussion in detail.
4. From the study, it is not clear whether the plant extracts are neurotoxic, cardiotoxic, hepatotoxic or nephrotoxic? More literary survey on these two plant extracts and their chemical components must be done and must be incorporated in the manuscript.
5. The usual use of these plant extracts is not mentioned or the reason these plant extracts are chosen. Why only the aqueous extract is considered for investigation is not clear. Please elaborate.
6. It is found that the body weight of the rats has increased, but there is no discussion on the reason for it.
7. The authors can refer to this article (<https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2023.1092032>) to understand the effect of β -sitosterol which is present in *Clematis hirsuta*.
8. The images are not clear, tables for the groups of rats must be introduced in result section, number of rats in a group, total number of groups are not clear.
9. The results can be summarized in a graph.
10. Any study is incomplete with a satisfactory conclusion. Authors must rewrite the conclusion of the study.