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

Jaideep Sarkar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

2.2: Voucher no is required as proof. Was it done by a qualified taxonomist? Please mention this

2.3: air dried under shade or room or sun? Hot air or cold air or room temperature air. Grade of ethanol: lab or cleaning or analytical?

2.6: basis of dose selection for Acute Oral tox in mice. Why OECD 401, 423 or 425 not followed? LD 50 not determined is scientific way. The LD50 established in mice and the dose levels used are different. Kindly specify the method used to determine LD50.

Excess wastage of animals in acute toxicity in mice. How ethical committee approved the use? Species and strain of mice? Why not rat and why mice was used? Control group was given water while other treated groups were given ethanolic extract. This is not the acceptable way to keep groups. Biasness will be introduced as control is only after while treated groups will have significant toxicity from ethanol exposure too.

Ethanolic extract will have added side effect in liver as ethanol and methanol are known to be liver toxins. Why not a base line data was used or a group with positive control, negative control was kept? Why aqueous extract was not used to have a baseline correction to remove the toxicity by ethanol be neutralized?

2.7: basis of dose selection for sub-acute oral tox? No regulatory guideline followed. Reference is of an author and publication. However OECD TG exist for 24 days study. Recovery group not present. Non-compliance with regulatory guidelines for 28 days oral tox. NOAEL/NOEL/LOAEL/LOEL not derived in the study.

2.10: why only 2 tissue histopathology was performed? In repeat dose 28 days oral tox, kindly find the OECD407 for more clarity.