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

Bright Yaw Vigbedor[1]

1 University of Health and Allied Sciences

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

REVIEW COMMENTS

The research data presents an interesting outcome relevant for the safety, standardization and the ethnobotanical utilization the *Olea Africana* in herbal formulations. The authors further present standardized methods for evaluating their research objectives. Moreover, the data from the study is clearly presented and linked with similar studies done in literature. The authors should take note of the following and revise the manuscript accordingly. Notwithstanding these comments, the authors could provide rebuttals where necessary.

ABSTRACT

The abstract succinctly gives a brief overview of the studies

INTRODUCTION

1. The references in this session are quite old. The authors should consider incorporating or replacing some of the older references with references within the last five year to account for current trends in the study area.
2. Moreover, this session looks quite scanty and hence needs additional revisions. Since the study is about phytomedicines and their toxicities, the authors could consider incorporating findings that hinges on the statistical overview and the enormous benefits derived from plants over the world and then briefly zooming in on their cytotoxicity as illustrated in the first paragraph.
3. The authors should provide the common name of the plants in the second paragraph
4. The sentence below lacks reference (s): ‘’**Furthermore, long-term use of these formulations, as well as a lack of proper dosage guidelines, highlight the need to investigate the oral toxicity of such formulations’’.**
5. The sentence in not accurate: ‘’**The scientific literature is replete with pharmacological reports on*Olea africana's* anthelmintic, antibacterial, antihypertensive, and anti-diarrheal activities’’.** The authors should consider revising this comment.
6. The author should provide information on actual compounds isolated from the plants if any and not just the general phytochemical list provided.

METHODOLOGY

Session 2.2: The authors should quote the geographical coordinate of where the plants were collected.

Session 2.3: The authors should avoid beginning sentences with figures. The % yield of the extract should be quoted.

Session 2.5 line 3: while groups 3, 4, and 5 contained 10 µg/mL, 100 µg/mL, and **100 µg/mL** of the extract. Is the 100 µg/mL a repetition. The authors should check and revise.

Optional: The authors could have investigated the phytochemical content of the extracts. This could give clues into the account for the reported toxicity of the plant. A similar comment is made at the discussion session.

DISCUSSION: The discussion is well presented. However, the authors should give a brief literature of the possible mechanistic account of the reported activity and the likelihood of the role played by the phytochemicals identified in the plants as presented in the introduction. There seems to be no account to the reported toxicity in relation to the effects of the **dosage levels** and the roles played by **phytochemicals** in both the toxicity and therapeutic effects of the plant.

CONCLUSION: The content of the conclusion is quite scanty; the authors should consider revising and drawing technical inferences from the study objectives.

REFERENCES: It seems most of the references are more than 10 years old. The author should consider adding more references within the last five years to augment current trends in the study area.

RECOMMENDATION: If the authors are able to address the concerns and all technical content raised by raised by others, the research article could be considered for publication.