

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"

Daniel Emmanuel Ekpo¹

¹ Guangxi Academy of Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. There are language and grammar errors. I suggest reading through again.
2. Abstract: **Conclusion:** In conclusion, this is not necessary.
3. °C : Please use the correct symbols for degrees, not a superscripted zero.
4. Gallic acid standard curve: R² should be 0.9... not 0,9...
5. Please provide a detailed interpretation of the results of histology of liver tissue. Pointers showing recovery or damage to liver tissues in different sections are important.
6. Discussion: "These secondary metabolites detected were responsible for the biological activity of the leaf." Authors sound too definite here without clear experiments showing the involvement of flavonoids in the observed biological activity tested. I recommend isolation and purification of the flavonoid content of the fraction to test before suggesting such an effect.
7. From the results, authors reported higher total phenolic content (1425.22 mg GAE/g) and flavonoid content (802.01 mg QE/g). GC-MS data does not corroborate findings as polyphenols were not identified in the extract.
8. "The GC-MS analysis of the methanol leaf extract showed the presence of eighteen (18) compounds belonging to different classes. It showed mainly nine saturated and unsaturated fatty acids, two fatty acid derivatives, one polyphenol, and two alcohols" The extract contained mainly fatty acids, but reported activity points to flavonoids and phenolics.
9. The statement "The presence of high amounts of phenolic and flavonoids as well as other metabolites must have been responsible for the observed biological activity in this study" The authors must not be so definitive as the tests carried out are not sufficient to prove the claims.