



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_48092
Title of the Manuscript:	The Potency of Bombax costatum Stem-bark Extract As a Hepato-curative Agent On Acetaminophen Induced Hepato Toxicity In Wistar Albino Rats
Type of the 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>)

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	<p>I think the authors have tried to show that plant extracts do not cure a hepato-tox rat model and may do harm. They partially characterized a very crude extract, found a non-lethal dose level, and compared drug-extract with pharmacy drug. The data is all over the place, the tables are impossible to use, and the methods are not described adequately.</p> <p>The authors appear to believe that every data point needs to be shown and the reader needs to work out what is different, why, and whether it is of clinical significance. No thank you.</p> <p>Clean up the tables.</p> <p>How many rats were used? Line 104, the authors describe 30 experimental rats; line 113, they described 20 rats. The tables describe rats that were dosed with out therapy and with therapy??? Did they re-use rats?</p>	<p>Thank you so much for the observation, but your perception of the work is entirely opposite what the research was set to achieve and the concurrent result therein.</p> <p>With due apology, we can't phantom where you are exactly driving at and what correction(s) you really want us to effect.</p> <p>With due respect, how?</p> <p>The 20 rats used in the acute toxicity studies were solely for the determination of the dosage range to be administered and does not in any way affect the experimental design in line 104</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Line 94, what is "cold" extract, refrigerator or room temperature?? Line 96, what solvent was removed, water or MeOH?? What was the temperature of the evaporator bath? Line 97, what is the extract, a dry powder, paste, liquid?? Lines 129 and 133, what is the difference between the groups, both are described as "without" silymarin treatment?? Table 2, were the observations blinded, how long were the animals observed, some appear to be 24 hours, some less, some more? Line 207, distilled water or saline, which was used?</p>	<p>Statements in Line 94 - 207 are common terms used in natural products research that does not require further clarification.</p> <p>The observations made in Line: 129 – 133 is quite appreciated and corrections effected.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Line 128 and table 3, placebo is not a placebo. The rats were not fooled, maybe the authors fooled themselves? Do them mean a control?</p>	<p>With much regards, how do you mean?</p>



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> I don't understand how many animals were used.	Thirty(30) animals were used and should not be confused with the twenty (20) used in the acute study to established the dosage range.