

Review of: "Phytochemical Contents, GC-MS Analysis and Hepatoprotective Effect of the Methanol Leaf Extract of *Camelliasinensis* (L.) Kuntze on Paracetamol-Induced Liver Injury in Wistar Rats"

M. K. Lonare¹

¹ Guru Angad Dev Veterinary and Animal Sciences University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thanks for the invitation to review the article entitled Phytochemical Contents, GC-MS Analysis and Hepatoprotective Effect of the Methanol Leaf Extract of *Camelliasinensis* (L.) Kuntze on Paracetamol-Induced Liver Injury in Wistar Rats". The author did some work on the indigenous medicinal plant material of that country. The findings are very significant, no doubt, but the way in which the paper was written by the author is not of good quality.

A few suggestions and questions for the author and editors are enlisted here for the improvement of the quality of the paper.

Abstract:

1. The quality of the abstract written is not good or impressive. Many mistakes were made by the author in the abstract.
2. The first sentence of the abstract is wrongly written. *Camellia*..... and for treating.....cancer. Correct it and make a meaningful sentence.
3. The 4th and 5th lines - he wrote randomly, groups of five rats or six rats ? The author is not sure how many. Needs correction in the sentence grammatically also.
4. He wrote "extract" in the 8th line of the extract. The author should specify the extract's specific type.
5. Lines 10-12 are not clear. Liver biomarkers, write the names of the parameters.

Introduction:

1. Line 1 doesn't have any meaning. There is no proper continuity between sentences.
2. Paragraph two (1-4 lines) has no proper continuity between lines. Rewrite the complete lines.
3. Overall, the introduction is poorly written. Needs significant improvement.
4. No reason to develop such a hypothesis has been clarified at the end of the introduction.

Materials and methods:

1. Author uses the word "leaves-stem bark...", but the meaning is not clear. Which part did the author use for study? In one part of the 2.1 section, he wrote "leaves and stem bark," while writing in the 2.2 section, last line, he wrote "leaf

extract." The author himself is not clear about what he has done.

2. % yield shown by the author is around 45.97%, needs to be verified once again before committing to publication, indicates nearly 50%, which has never been possible for the extractability of the plant materials.
3. Section 2.3: The author should provide references for the reference methods used for each of the parameters.
4. Section 2.4: Again, the author wrote "stem bark...." Why is he using different terminology? He should provide the name of the place (department and place) where he performed GC-MS analysis.
5. Section 2.8: Guideline number OECD 452 given by the author is wrong; this is for chronic toxicity study. That should be OECD TG 420.
6. Section 2.10: ".....creatine and biochemical parameters were evaluated.....using BC-2800 auto haematology analyser and reflotron plus.....kits" Why is the author writing "haematology analyser" as he has not performed any haematology? Why is he writing biochemical names... elaborate on other parameters' names...if he has done.
7. What was the time of histopathology sample collection? Not clear. The total duration of the study is not clear.
8. Section 2.12: What test was performed? ANOVA, but it is not clear in the table how comparison was done, by comparing with control or between the different groups. It has been observed in all tables of RESULTS. Ideally, comparison should be done with the normal control and disease control vs. treatment group, and % amelioration should be calculated, and conclusions should be drawn.

Results

1. All tables should be clear by providing the footnote on how comparison was done by the author.
2. Results are written very casually and unclearly.
3. HP pictures should be clearly labeled with the changes below the pictures. The author has not even mentioned changes in the disease control groups and ameliorative groups, only portal vein/blood vessels shown by the author.
4. The author has not written in the results about the acute oral toxicity experiment.
5. Rewriting of proper results is required. All results should be elaborated in good language.
6. Fig. 2. $R^2=0.9811$, what is this? Or 0.9811?
7. He has not written in the materials and methods about Table 4 parameters, nor written in the results about this in detail.

Discussion

1. Significant improvement in the language and flow of sentences of the discussion is needed.

Overall, the quality of the paper is poor and needs extensive revision.