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

Armando Gomez Ojeda[1]

1 Universidad de Guanajuato

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Toxicological evaluation on traditional herbal medicine it is undoubtedly a main research subject, consumer's safety is the basis of medicine ("above all do not harm" Hypocrates).

The aim of the authors of this work is to obtain evidence about the safety of the consumption of Clematis hirsuta leaves and Rhamnus prinoides roots aqueous extracts.

After carefully reading this manuscript, I found the current subject appropriate for this journal, the relevance of the study seems adequate, nevertheless I recommend this work must be rejected and resubmitted after major changes.

Data normality needs to be asses (Kolmogorov – Smirnoff) before further statistical analysis, and then use mean or median depending on that, the data that presented normal distribution must be expressed as means ± standard deviation (SD). To describe the data without normal distribution, must be used medians, ranges and percentages. If data is non parametric, the use of T-student test is not the adequate test.

In Experimental animals section, authors stated that 56 female individuals were selected (why only female rats?), but there is no information on why authors used this sample size, or any information on the sample size calculation.

Also authors must state how many rats were assigned to which group, authors are assessing toxicity on Clematis hirsuta aqueous leaf and Rhamnus prinoides aqueous root extracts. There are three groups? If so, how many rats were included in each group?

On Acute toxicity section authors stated that "Each group contained five rats, and the maximum dose of each extract was 2000 mg/kg. Only distilled water was given to the rats in the control group." But if they selected 56 female rats, there is a discrepancy on the number of individual on each group. But mainly authors must state each group and the number of rats in each group.

Although authors state the maximum dose administered, it is unclear if rats had access to water and administered solution, or if they only provide access to water through the solution.

Because of the above mentioned the relevance of the subject of this study is justified, but it is not suitable for publication it in its current form.