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

Fatimah Salim[1]

1 Universiti Teknologi Mara

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Apart from some technical errors ie capital and small letters, formatting etc, here are some points that the authors can consider to improvise the article:

1. Title: The species and genus name should be written italic. In fact, for any species, only at 1st time mentioning the genus needs to be spell out. For the rest mentioning just use ie C. hirsuta
2. Abstract: I suggest the abstract to be more focus as what has been written in the Introduction ‘Leaves and roots of Clematis hirsuta and Rhamnus prinoides respectively are used to treat type 2 diabetes in NyeriCounty, Kenya’. The research gap that has been highlighted is ‘However, there is no evidence to back up their safety’. But when I simply Google, there are some works that have been published. Please check. Need to mention the extracts' concentration used in this study.
3. Introduction: Need to check the correct way of writing compounds' name. ie S should be italic
4. Methods: ‘Leaves of Clematis hirsuta and roots of Rhamnus prinoides were sourced from Nyeri County.’ from Subsection 2.2 should be moved to 2.3. Voucher specimens and authentication authority are needed for each sample in 2.3. Temperature of hot water needs to be mentioned in 2.4. In 2.6, the authors mentioned ‘the maximum dose of each extract was 2000 mg/kg. The other doses used need to be mentioned as well.
5. Results: I am not sure if this suggestion works. But I think subtopics 3.1.1 - 3.1.4 should be removed. The results are sufficient to be presented together in one subtopic, but maybe in different paragraph. The data in Table 1 & 2 could be presented better ie under 25 mg/kg create 2 columns one for CH and one for RP. Easy to compare the data and no need to repeat the doses.
6. Discussion: Need to correlate the activities to the previously reported chemical constituents from the studied species that might responsible to the activities.
7. Conclusion: should answer the objective to the research. And some recommendation is needed ie isolation and identification of the active principle that responsible for the activities.