



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_22036
Title of the Manuscript:	ACUTE TOXICITY OF AQUEOUS AND ETHANOLIC EXTRACTS OF <i>Strophanthus hispidus</i> STEM BACK
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title of the manuscript is written incorrectly. Line 2-3: ACUTE TOXICITY OF AQUEOUS AND ETHANOLIC EXTRACTS OF <i>Strophanthus hispidus</i> STEM BACK Abstract Line 10: Poor english “Varying doses of the extracts for 24 hrs and further for 72 hrs”. Rewrite the sentence. Lines 11-12: Treatment related mortality was observed at doses of 1000 mg/kg body weight and above for both extracts. Incorrect statement. As per table 1 aqueous extract of <i>S hispidus</i> did not cause any mortality at a dose 1000 mg/kg body weight. Lines 16-17: Rephrase, poor english “the results showed that doses of up to 1000 mg/kg body weight and above of <i>S. hispidus</i> stem bark may be slightly toxic. INTRODUCTION Line 26: a great number of plat species.....	I want to appreciate you for painstakingly going through my article and wish to state that I am in consonant with most of your comments. I have also taken time to effect the corrections. However I find some of the suggestions very strange, like writing <i>S hispidus</i> as against <i>S. hispidus</i>.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 35-36: Rephrase, poor english “Only few of these herbal products have scientific-research information about their toxic levels in Literatures. Line 38-39: Its popularity in folklore medicine..... Pl mention specifically for which ailments <i>S hispidus</i> is being used. Materials and Method Line 55: The stems of <i>Strophanthus hispidus</i>... Line 61: The stems of <i>Strophanthus hispidus</i>..... There is no necessity of repeating the plants name fully all the time. The authors have mentioned it in Line 37. Therefore it is enough to write <i>S hispidus</i> and not <i>S. hispidus</i> Line 71: The method of [9] for the ? The author should mention whose method they followed. Line 80: poor english, rephrase: Observations were carried on for 72 hours..... Acute toxicity study: Lines 80-81: In the second phase, four rats in group 1 were made into four groups of one rat each..... The question is just observing 1 rat per group is sufficient enough to make a comprehensive	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	conclusion regarding LD₅₀? Result Except the two tables no interpretation is given in the result section. Lines 11-12: Treatment related mortality was observed at doses of 1000 mg/kg body weight and above for both extracts. Comments have been done in the Abstract section. Discussion Discussion is too vague. Going through the first part of the discussion it seems that the manuscript is written for antidiabetic plant. Whereas the authors mentioned that <i>S hispidus</i> is being used for the treatment of diabetes only almost at the end i.e. at Line 150. Therefore, the authors are advised to rewrite the initial part of the discussion. Line 164: [1] Has reported..... The expression is totally incorrect. The authors must mention the names of the 1st author. Lines 169-171 :..... or relatively safe more so that..... Rewrite the sentence	Yes. Lorke, (1983) and Up-and-Down Procedure of OECD, (2001) are supportive documents. However Lorke's method was used in this study.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript contains a number of typographical errors. For example, font is not identical all through the manuscript. The Headings are also not similar. For example, Abstract, Introduction and Materials & methods are written in all cap, on the contrary, Results and discussion are not in all cap. Ethical Issues: The authors used animals (rats) in persuing the study. Therefore they needed the ethical clearance from the respected authority before conducting this study.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		