

Review of: "Toxicity of *Olea africana* in *Artemia Salina* and Mice"

Walid Abdallah

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Editor,

Qeios

Thank you for your trust, and my comments on the manuscript submission:

Ref: Submission ID: Qeios ID: TBU0MX · <https://doi.org/10.32388/TBU0MX>

Qeios, CC-BY 4.0 · Article, July 15, 2023

Authors present an article: "**Toxicity of *Olea africana* in *Artemia salina* and Mice**"

After having carefully read the manuscript, it seems that in my opinion, the manuscript in its present forms has a lot of deficiencies and I recommend its acceptance after a major revision, before being suitable for publication in **Qeios**.

Reviewer Comments:

1. This manuscript needs thorough revision with respect to spellings, grammatical corrections and there should be uniformity in the text. So it is necessary to revise the whole manuscript by English language experts.
2. Also, the authors have used abbreviations in the manuscript without explaining them. Any abbreviation is provided after the complete description. The complete words are used in their first appearance and after that the abbreviations can be used. This comment is valid for all the abbreviations wherever they have been used.
3. Author should explain the novelty of this work as this work being stated in the previous literature.
4. « *In-vitro* », « *In-vivo* » and « *Plant species* » etc. should be written in italics throughout the manuscript even in the small titles.
5. The title of the manuscript can be better and more attractive; it should be more precise and represent to the contents to be a comprehensive scientific title.
6. Background is too short with little details about previous studies and phytochemical constituents isolated before.
7. The authors should mention full name of authentication plant consultant in the methodology section and the voucher herbarium No. should be included.

8. The authors state the Ethics Committee approval ID number and year of approval certificate in 2019..Is that correct? Four years for doing this work....Clarify?
9. Citations are missing in most methodology section.
10. Brine shrimp eggs were purchased commercially ? FROM? AUTHENTICATED?
11. In methodology section (Sub –acute toxicity in mice ...28 female mice (4 Cages, each housing 4 mice? Not correct... Clarify? How come?
12. Table one ... The toxicity of *Olea africana* in mice 4297.30 µg/ml, where the results of acute toxicity assay in mice for seven groups?
13. The presentation of results in Results section should be rewrite and presented in a comprehensive and scientific way as Duplication of figures numbers in every line is not good.
14. In results section (Sub –acute toxicity in mice ...Table 2 ? As the dose 100 mg/kg display non-significant...why using high doses as 600 mg/kg? Clarify?
15. Figures 1,2,3 and 4 in the manuscript is of poor quality, the authors have to be prepared it again in high resolution,
16. The authors did not talk about the major constituents in the plant? And they role with each other as synergistic or antagonistic and also in comparable with each other.
17. The authors did not mention what is the cause of toxicity in the plant and compare with previous studies?
18. NO chemistry for the plant as to strength the work regarding the plant constituents in discussion section.
19. NO communication between this study and previous studies, if agree or disagree, with the previous studies to have a clear and comprehensive discussion.
20. The conclusion can be improved.