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

A.K. Salau

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. **ABSTRACT:** ".....data from the subacute toxicity study was summarized as mean±standard deviation and analyzed using...". This statement contradicts the footnotes to Tables 1 and 2 shown as *(mean ± SEM, n = 5)*
2. The following statement: ".....nor did they have any significant effects on weight, biochemical, or hematological parameters when compared to controls....." is untrue because significant alterations were reported for some haematological and biochemical parameters.
3. **MATERIALS:** The voucher numbers of each plant specimen should be stated.
4. The authors did not describe the method of blood collection.
5. Under statistical analysis, authors should declare whether they used mean±standard deviation or mean±SEM. This would have been better than the contradictions in the abstract and the table footnotes.
6. No details on extract administration and how the blood samples were collected or method of animal sacrifice.
7. **RESULTS:** ".....the weight gain in extract-treated rats was not significantly different ($p>0.05$) from the weight gain in untreated (control) rats in the second week of treatment. Figure 4A.....". This statement also contradicts the same Figure 4A, where significant changes were shown from week 2 at the highest dose.
8. For Figure 4B, it should be stated that the highest dose gained weight from week 1 of the experiment.
9. For Table 2 under urea, the control value of 12.45 cannot be assigned superscript b, it would rather carry superscript c. The last column value of 9.61 cannot carry superscript abc, it would rather be a or ab.
10. The values indicated in the tables were means±SEM according to footnotes. This means the standard deviation values are quite higher than these. For example, BAS and EO values of 0.02 had SEM values of 0.01, indicating weak because the SD values would be higher than the SEM values. PLT values 171.20 and 410.60 show statistical similarity due to high SD values and weak precision. Same applies to the values in Figures 1 A and B.
11. **DISCUSSION:** The discussion section is not robust enough because the authors did not link their findings to previously reported phytochemical components of these plants. Studies as recent as 2021 have reported phytochemical contents of both plants, which the authors should have used. This weakens their recommendations at the end of the discussion section, which even came ahead of conclusion.
12. The observations above should be considered and the paper can be revised accordingly.