



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <u><a href="#">European Journal of Medicinal Plants</a></u>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_EJMP_26262  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | EVALUATION OF MEDIAN LETHAL DOSE AND SUBCHRONIC ORAL TOXICITY ASSESSMENT OF ETHANOLIC LEAF EXTRACT OF PHYLLANTHUS AMARUS |
| 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**

|                                     | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>1. I wonder how the author(s) came about the working dose they utilized in this study. They should please indicate.</p> <p>2. If the median lethal dose of the extract was greater than 5000 mg/kg, picking working dose of 300 mg/kg was far too low.</p> <p>3. In Pharmacology and Toxicological studies, the conventional method is, after determining the LD<sub>50</sub>, 2 to 3 dose levels are usually investigated. But the author(s) just worked on 300 mg/kg only, and which is on the very low side from the LD<sub>50</sub>. It would have been technically robust, if three dose levels of 300 mg/kg, 600 mg/kg, 900 or 1200 mg/kg have been investigated.</p> <p>If the above issues are adequately dealt with, then for the paper to be fit for acceptance, the following corrections are to be effected:</p> <p><b>Lines 8 to 12</b> : It will be better to put these under the different headings within the abstract.</p> <p><b>Line 13:</b> (Study design): This is not a study design. Your study design is <b>'One-</b></p> |  |



SDI Review Form 1.6

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p><b>factor, one</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>control - one test group experimental design'.</b></p> <p><b>Line 16:</b> Always put a space between value and the unit.<br/>That is; '2000 mg/kg and not 2000mg/kg'.<br/>(do same to all others so written).</p> <p><b>Line 21:</b> change to 'showed'.</p> <p><b>Line 24:</b> You may need to delete this word.</p> <p><b>Line 25:</b> This may not be necessary in your conclusion.</p> <p><b>Line 84:</b> You may need to re-frame this statement.</p> <p><b>Line 86:</b> Check for the correct spelling.</p> <p><b>Lines 135 to 146 (Table 2):</b> Why is table 2 coming before table 1? Please arrange table 2 properly.</p> <p><b>Lines 161 to 168 (Discussion):</b> These lines are better under introduction. So remove the highlighted, and begin your discussion with some few lines on the aim of your study, followed by the results you got and then discuss these results in the light of existing studies that corroborate (or otherwise) your findings. So it will be better you delete them and start your discussion from <b><i>"this study attempted to evaluate the LD50..."</i></b></p> <p><b>Lines 203 to 207 (Conclusion):</b> The highlighted are not necessary in conclusion so you may need to delete them.</p> |  |
|--|---|--|



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                                  |  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The standard SDI template that am familiar with, will have numbers for sectional headings, sub-headings and sub-subheadings. These are lacking in this manuscript. Author(s) should check this out.</li><li>2. Check for grammatical errors and correct them.</li></ol> |  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments | The standard SDI template that<br>The author(s) will notice that I have highlighted the areas where corrections are to be made. Bringing your cursor to the highlights will bring up a pop-up dialogue box for my comments.  |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b><i>O. Imoru Joshua</i></b>                     |
| Department, University & Country | <b><i>Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria</i></b> |