

Review of: "Hepatoprotective Effect of the Ursolic Acid-Oleanolic Acid Mixture Administered Intragastrically in Mice with Liver Damage Induced by Anti-TB Drugs"

Juan Peragón¹

¹ Universidad de Jaén

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

January 12th, 2024

Review of the article:

Title: "Hepatoprotective effect of the ursolic acid-oleanolic acid mixture administered intragastrically in mice with liver damage induced by anti-TB drugs"

Author: Jiménez-Arellanes, M.A.

Journal: Qeios, CC-BY 4.9

Doi: 10.32388/FSKEIX

General comment:

In my opinion, this work is preliminary. A more complete and exhaustive work is needed to affirm the conclusion discussed. The parameters assayed must be better explained, and also they must be amplified.

Comments:

1. Title. The title is very specific; it can be rewritten. The abbreviations in the title must be avoided, in particular "... anti-TB drugs". The meaning of TB must be explained.
2. Throughout the manuscript, many abbreviations are used. These must be removed to avoid misleading or confusion.
3. Page 3, Materials and Methods section, Obtention of UA/OA mixture subsection. Results that demonstrate the identity of the mixture used in the experiment must be showed.
4. Page 3, Materials and Methods section, In vivo assay subsection. First sentence. "... male Balb/C mice..."). Why were these mice used? The characteristics of these mice must be added. The meaning of the abbreviation IMSS must be added.
5. Page 4. Hepatoprotector activity subsection. More details about how the different compounds are administered must be added.
6. Page 4. Quantification of parameters of oxidative stress subsection. The parameters determined are limited, and more

details about how they are assayed must be added.

7. Figure 1. The legend of the figure must be updated to avoid misleading. Two “Group IV” exist, whereas no “Group III” is found. The statistical significance must be added to the values plotted in the figure.
8. Tables. The statistical treatment and the statistical significance must be appropriately added to the table. It is not clear what values were significantly different.
9. The results of microscopy (Text, Table 3, Figure 2) must be clearly explained and justified. It is not enough to say, for example, that “...showed slightly steatosis,” or to present the results of steatosis only as mild, moderate, intense, or negative.
10. In my opinion, the conclusions are not enough supported by the results, which are preliminary.