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

Nessana Dartora[1]

1 Federal University of Fronteira Sul

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear editor.

Thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript entitled “Toxicological evaluation of aqueous extracts of*Clematis hirsuta* and *Rhamnus prinoides*”. After reading it, my recommendation is to**accept the work, subject to the recommended changes**.

Comments

Abstract

In the abstract it is described that the rats treated with the extracts of*Clematis hirsuta* leaves and *Rhamnus prinoides* roots reduced the consumption of water and food, but did not have their body weight affected. However, it is not what is described in the results. I therefore suggest reviewing this information.

Introduction

In general, it is good, but check that references number 7 and 33 cannot be changed by more current references. They date back more than twenty years.

Methodology.

In item 2.3 there is the deposit report of the species indicated in the herbarium, please indicate the deposit registration number.

Item 2.4 describes the preparation of plant extracts, which will be evaluated for their toxicity. In the introduction, the authors report that toxicity is generally attributed to secondary metabolites of plants. Note that in this type of extraction, the major components are carbohydrates, such as polysaccharides. As there is no type of secondary metabolite composition analysis, I suggest making it clear that they are not the majority in this type of extraction.

In item 2.6, with regard to acute toxicity, the authors report having five rats for each group, totaling twenty-one rats. Twenty-one is not a multiple of five, how can that be true? After all, how many groups were there? What dosages were used? For me, this was not clear.

At the end of this same item, I suggest inserting that physical examination was also performed, since this result is cited.

In item 2.7, where the methodology for subacute toxicity is described, the authors inform that hematological and biochemical parameters were evaluated. I strongly suggest that these parameters be described here, because they are only described later in the results.

Results

Item 3.3 describes which hematological parameters were evaluated, this is part of the methodology, not the result.

Also in this item, referring to the PLP, in the statistical analysis, the authors demonstrate that the control (ab) is statistically equal to the dose of 225 mg/Kg CH(b). This is not what I observe, considering the standard deviation. I suggest reviewing this data!

Item 3.4 describes which biochemical parameters were evaluated, this is part of the methodology, not the result.

Discussion

Here, the authors basically discuss the change in body weight of the rats treated with the extracts to be evaluated, without however finding an explanation, since the consumption of food and water in these rats was reduced.

But there is no discussion about the biochemical and hematological parameters that have changed. If there is no discussion, why were they made?

The discussion should be improved considerably.

Sincerely,

Nessana Dartora