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

Abumalé Cruz-Salomón[1]

1 Universidad Autónoma de Chiapas

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear editor, first I thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript. The authors carried out the toxicological evaluation of two aqueous extracts (Clematis hirsuta leaves and Rhamnus prinoides roots) in mice and analyzed the biochemical and hematological parameters.

The Manuscript is interesting, however, it cannot be accepted in the present form. Here are my suggestions:

- In the abstract, the part of the results or discussion is not clear or new. please highlight the results.
- What period or month were the plants collected? phenological state of the plants?
- What is the identification number of the plant or registration? it is important to add to ensure that if it is the plant you mention.
- please describe the drying method in detail.
- Please add the geographic coordinates of collection of the plants, height and average temperature of the region.
- add citations in methodology.
- add in the methodology that biochemical and hematological parameters measured.
- It would be very important to add the chemical composition of the extracts and be able to do an in-silico analysis to predict toxicity and other biological activity. I suggest add.
- Add space between "of_Clematis" on the first line and penultimate of page 5, check page 6.
- In figure 1, italicize the scientific name of the plants on the X axis.
- Pls report in a better way that there is or not statistical difference, the way in which it indicates it is not appropriate or correct. for example "was significantly lower than". Remember that statistically there is or is not a difference.
- The analysis of figure 2 is confusing, regarding the statistical differences. Remember significant statistical difference ($p < .05$) and no statistical difference ($p > .05$).
- Please verify the data that you added on the bars of the graphs because they do not seem to coincide in some figures, for example, 1a, 1b, 2b, 3a.
- add space in page 7, "between_C." and "of_R."
- please check the graphs and statistical analysis (verify if the analysis is parametric or non-parametric in the software).
- add a space in all units of measure, review throughout the document.
- in table 1. put the "a" after the standard deviation values.
- the discussion is very poor, needs to improve it.

- Did you perform histological analysis of the mice to see organ damage?
- very redundant information "presented in the current"
- Improve the conclusion, they have quite an interesting work.
- I suggest reviewing this manuscript https://doi.org/10.3390/ph15080943
- The document must be reviewed by a native English speaker.