

# Review of: "Hepatoprotective Effect of the Ursolic Acid-Oleanolic Acid Mixture Administered Intragastrically in Mice with Liver Damage Induced by Anti-TB Drugs"

Cristian A.D. Vecchia<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Community University of Chapecó Region - Unochapecó

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Firstly, I would like to congratulate the author for this study, as it is of great importance for the advancement of the pharmacology of natural products, as well as public health. As this is a recurring problem in several countries. However, there are some points that need to be better clarified so that the article is suitable for publication in this journal. All the following statements are to qualify the work and not to denigrate it.

1 - There is no description of the plant in the introduction, methods, results and/or discussion. It is not known how the plant was obtained, as well as a description of the isolation of the compounds. Furthermore, botanical identification by a professional is lacking.

2 - Why the choice to develop a methanolic extract? In popular use, extracts are developed with aqueous or hydroalcoholic solvents (ethanol).

3- How did the author arrive at the values for the doses used? It is necessary to explain how these values were arrived at, to better understand the dose response calculation.

4 - Choosing just two doses ends up harming the veracity and reproducibility of the response found, mainly because the lower dose had a better effect. It would have been important to have also carried out tests with doses lower than 10 mg/kg, as this would allow us to know whether the most effective dose really is the one described by the author.

5- How many male Balb/C mice were used? How old? And how many rats were included per group?

6 - Figure 1 presents two IV groups, the groups should be more clearly defined.

7 - Lacking data on the NMR fragmentation pattern, there is no way to truly prove that the compounds mentioned are those described by the author.

8 - There is no information on antioxidant analyzes in the results or in the discussion.

9 - The article presents grammatical problems, as well as does not comprehensively discuss its results. It just repeats the information obtained in the discussion.

Dear editor, the article presents several development flaws, as well as obtuse results. For publication in your magazine,

several adjustments would be necessary. I hope I contributed.