SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJPR_26262
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF MEDIAN LETHAL DOSE AND SUBCHRONIC ORAL TOXICITY ASSESSMENT OF ETHANOLIC LEAF EXTRACT OF PHYLLANTHUS AMARUS
Type of Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:			
FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments		
The author(s) have not adequately address the issue on working dose. The "previous	The evaluator is technically very correct regarding the three (3) doses (300, 600, 900 or 1200		
experience" mentioned was a work done on the anti-malaria and pancreatic tonic potential	mg/kg/bwt) which would have made this study more robust. Authors have indeed, noted this for		
of P. amarus from which, I want to believe, an acute toxicity test was carried out and a LD ₅₀	future designs.		
was estimated, and a particular dose level (probably 300 mg/kg) was worked with. If this is			
true, it does not address the issue raised. Actually a fundamental technical error was made			
by just picking single working dose which is far too low from the LD ₅₀ . Let it be reiterated,			
that in Pharmacology and Toxicological studies, the conventional method is; after			
determining the LD ₅₀ , 2 to 3 dose levels are usually investigated, with the 3 rd dose (highest)			
not exceeding 1/3 rd of the LD50. This is while three dose levels of 300 mg/kg, 600 mg/kg,			
900 or 1200 mg/kg would have been technically robust for this study. Author should put			
this in mind in subsequent studies.			
I did say earlier that the standard SDI template that I'm familiar with will have numbering for sectional headings, sub-headings and sub-subheadings. These are lacking in this manuscript. Author(s) have not done anything to this effect nor gave reason to why they have not.	Numbering of sectional headings and sub-headings has been incorporated as suggested in line with the SDI template.		
navo not.	Authors hereby appreciate the contributions of the evaluators.		
Except for the above issues, the authors have done well in the revision of the manuscript.	The state of the state and state of the stat		

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.5 (4th August, 2012)