

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

Felix Ayisi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

### 2.4. Preparation of medicinal plant extracts

- Explain the ratio well, clearly state if the sample is 1 part and water 10 parts or otherwise.
- Please come clear here, was the extraction by cold maceration or decoction? you had earlier stated distilled water was added, so when was the decoction done?

## 2.6. Acute toxicity

· A brief explanation of the 'Limit test dose' procedure will be appropriate

### 2.7. Subacute toxicity

• 35 animals with 5 in a group given 7 groups, with three (3) test groups and one (1) control group making 4 groups, what happened to the three other groups?

### 4. Discussion

• .....Ironically, C. hirsuta-treated rats had lower feed and water consumption rates than control group rats......

# "Assign reasons for your observation"

• ....If this is the case, it is not expected that the rats will have a higher weight gain than the control group rats as was observed in this study. More studies are required to understand this discrepancy.....

"This statement suggests that you expected the extract to be toxic, claiming your observation to be a discrepancy. After all, you concluded that the extract was non-toxic, so Reconsider the statements".

• ......However, the feed and water consumption in R. prinoides-treated rats were lower than in the control group rats......

"Assign reasons for your observation"

Qeios ID: NF2PTD · https://doi.org/10.32388/NF2PTD