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

Sammy Davies Osagie-Eweka[1]

1 University of Benin

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

THE FOLLOWING ARE RECOMMEDED FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION

1. UNDER MEDICINAL PLANT COLLECTION & IDENTIFICATION (2.3): Please, you are strongly advised to include the Voucher Specimen number assigned to the plant at the herbarium for easy identification.
2. UNDER SECTION 3.3: The table 1 containing the hematological data do not completely indicate the data. The data are not properly presented; the *R. Prinoides* data of 75 and 225 mg/kg respectively are cut-off or missing
3. I AM UNABLE TO RECONCILE THE WBC DATA OF C. HIRSUTA TREATED GROUP AT 25 mg/kg (7.74 + 1.91) to the WBC data of the untreated group (4.81 + 0.93) which you reported that there is no statistically significant difference in the outcome. Several hematological parameters considered in your study are equally affected by the immediate observation mentioned above; considering the conspicuously large disparity/difference in the data reported.
4. The first paragraph of your discussion should appear as the last and concluding paragraph of your introductory section.
5. Data presented in figures 1 & 2 indicate that experimental group administered *C. hirsuta and R. prinoides* at 2000 mg/kg consumed less feed and water respectively; however gained weight when compared to the untreated group after 14 days? whereas, the untreated group consumed more feed and water; lost weight? The data is at variance with the circumstance that birthed the data. LESS FEED + LESS WATER CONSUMED AFTER 14 DAYS = WEIGHT GAIN? MORE FEED + MORE WATER CONSUMED AFTER 14 DAYS = WEIGHT LOSS? The above outcome doesn't make any scientific sense.
6. **Discussion**: No further study is required to understand the discrepancy. The irreconcilable outcome may be due to avoidable errors as the data presented are unacceptable because the outcome of such designed is expected and predictable: ***LESS FEED + LESS WATER CONSUMED AFTER 14 DAYS = WEIGHT LOSS? MORE FEED + MORE WATER CONSUMED AFTER 14 DAYS = WEIGHT GAIN?*** I strongly advise that the 14 day study on weight gain should be revisited.
7. The data should be presented as shown in the data table; discussion should reflect the data presented. Data should be properly analyzed (preferably at P value of 0.01) to obtained better statistically significant differences vis-à-vis the data obtained and presented in the tables.
8. The discussion should be enhanced taking into cognizance the data obtined and analyzed. The outcome should be compared with previous studies; whether related or unrelated to reflect the new contribution to knowledge; cited appropriately.