



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_45076
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Sub chronic Toxicity of Sonchus cornutus in Rats
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. I will do all corrections according o the Reviewers Comments.
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I. First of all, can the authors explain why a sub-chronic toxicity without acute toxicity study? The recommendation at end that LD50 should be determined in subsequent studies clearly shows that the acute toxicity is still to be carried out! A strong rationale to the current study (without acute toxicity!) therefore becomes a requirement! Or the authors could carry out the acute toxicity (According to OECD guideline 425 for testing of chemicals)</p> <p>II. In the Introduction, the authors should rewrite the background to clearly show the link between the species of interest and others, otherwise it is somewhat confusing!</p> <p>III. The authors wrote: the whole plant was used (Methodology, line 7): why was the entire plant used? Various parts of the body of a plant might contain different chemicals and their extract with the same solvent display different activities! A clear justification is needed here!</p> <p>IV. Furthermore, the period of plant collection must be indicated under plant collection and the Voucher number also indicated!</p> <p>V. Although the Authors indicated towards the end of the paper that they got the Ethical clearance, I have some concerns I would like them to address:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ethical consideration is the first step before getting inside the laboratory for experimentation. Therefore the corresponding section should be moved to the appropriate location under Materials and methods! 2. More worrying, why did the authors choose to use very young animals (4-5week old) for a toxicity study when they could very well use young adults or at least 8-9week old ones? As they are much younger, they are equally more vulnerable that adults! Could the authors refer to the mentioned NIH guideline to justify such protocol? <p>VI. Under Results, why were the slides from control and test groups looking of different stain, if they were all (according to the methodology) subjected to Hematox/Eosin staining?</p> <p>VII. The compared micrographs of the liver must be on similar fields i.e. displaying same structures!</p>	<p>I. Sub –chronic toxicity without acute toxicity, because the number of animals was limited. The number of cages was not enough. In treatment trials, repeated doses are needed.</p> <p>II. OK. (highlighted yellow)</p> <p>III. The aerial part of the plant was used (line 7 and 53),highlighted yellow.</p> <p>IV. The plant was collected on August 2017. The plant was deposited in the herbarium without voucher number.</p> <p>V. Ethical clearance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ethical consideration: The section has been moved to the Materials and methods (2.2.1). Line 63 highlighted yellow. 2. The authors used very young animals, because adult animals were not available at that time, and the number of whole animals was limited. The animals used were normal, healthy and well nourished. The biochemical and haematological tests in the control group , and all groups in week 1 confirm the health of the animals. The authors referred to the mentioned NIH guideline. <p>VI. The control and test group were stained with H& E. The control can be deleted.</p> <p>VII. OK.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I. First of all, there is a problem with the English language in this paper: the Authors should seek for the aid of an English proficient scientist! The authors should improve on the language to make the manuscript more digest for the reader!</p> <p>II. Review the tables to centralize the doses in their column!</p> <p>III. Authors should check their reference list, i.e. incomplete page numbering, first name instead of surname!</p>	<p>I. OK.</p> <p>II. OK. The tables have been written according to the Template</p> <p>III. OK. The corrections highlighted yellow.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>IV. Keywords should be added under Abstract</p> <p>V. MSc thesis should not be considered in a reference list in a peer-reviewed journal, if Ph.D. at least that can be accepted</p>	<p>IV. Key words: OK, highlighted yellow.</p> <p>V. MSc thesis reference: deleted.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>This is an original work, with interesting findings that could be used by the authors to raise awareness in the community, as <i>Sonchus oleraceus</i> has been consumed by many people in Sudan. Having for the first time (from what it seems to be!) information on the safety margins in a rodent (mammal like Human) is of high relevance.</p> <p>Working with the entire body of the plant without indicating that it is the way it has been used for consumption in the community nor discussing the possible variability of the activities if various parts were to be used!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluating sub-chronic activity without background knowledge on the acute toxicity in rat, meanwhile acute toxicity study is not very demanding! Exposing little rats to experiments better tolerated by young adults and without comparison to the latter! 	<p>The plant consumption; deleted. The amount consumed and the processing of the plant were not mentioned.</p> <p>The aerial part of the plant was used in the expt.</p> <p>It is better to use young adult rats. Young healthy rats were used, because young adult rats were not available.</p>

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>I believe yes, although the authors said to have got ethical clearance! Unless the authors can provide a strong rationale as to why this low age range (4-5 weeks) for the study of the toxicity! Not that it cannot be done but if adults can be used, there is ethically not justification for using more vulnerable animals! Especially as it is not in comparison to adults! Such exceptional cases need strong rationales!</p>	<p>Yes, Ethical Approval highlighted yellow in the text. All authors hereby declare that "principles of laboratory animal care" (NIH Publication No 85-23, revised 1988) were followed, as well as national laws were applicable. The protocol of this study for the use of laboratory animals was approved by the Ethical Approval No. EA /0019/2018. The Sudan Veterinary Council, Ministry of Cabinet , Republic of The Sudan(attached).</p> <p>Only low age animals used in the expt. were available. The haematological and biochemical parameters in the first week were normal. This means that the animals were healthy.</p>

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>