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

Dr. Shah Zaman[1]

1 University of Malakand

The report to review the article entitled **"Toxicological evaluation of aqueous extracts of** *Clematis hirsuta* **and** *Rhamnus prinoides***"** from Qeios written by Kinuthia *et al.* **The paper was thoroughly checked and** the following suggestions are given to improve the article:

a. The article needs improvement in terms of grammatical, typos errors.

b. The abstract portion need a clear hypothesis and novelty statement which are lacking.

c. The abstract portion should be provided with main results quantified in numerical values and also with methodological approach used in the current study.

d. There is missing information about the specimens/materials used for the current study e.g. how plant materials were collected, identified and information such as geo-reference (long/lat), Voucher number etc are missing.

e. Preparation of plant extracts needs how many grams of fresh plants were taken and how much dried plant powder were used for extraction. This section also needs how much time was taken for soaking the plant materials into the solvent. The ratio 1:10 is not clear which one represents 1 and 10 if 1 represent distilled water and 10 represent hot water then why the hot and distilled water is used justify the statement.

f. Section 3.1 striaght starts from stating figure while writing scientific writing one must mentioned the figure in the middle or last of the paragraph.

g. Explain different p values in figures

h. Why an increase in the mean body weight is noticed by using plant samples.

i. The parameters mentioned such as; hematological and biochemicals values should accompanied by the study of anatomy of organs (Liver, spleen, and kidneys) under SEM to confirm the toxicity/safety of the tested samples.

j. There author need to perform phytochemical screening (identification and quatification) of selected plants to correlate findings.

k. The discussion section is poor and needs logical discusson.

l. The conclusion section needs elaboration of the main findings, shortcomes, and then recommendation.