



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_46165
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute and subacute toxicity of the aqueous aerial parts extract of <i>Oxalis barrelieri</i> (Oxalidaceae)
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>)



[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>The manuscript requires major corrections as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abstract. What is the meaning of possible toxic effect? In my opinion, it's not necessary to mention the word "possible effect", just directly "toxic effects"</li> <li>2. Introduction. There are a lot informations which cited from one reference (Page 1 Line 32-48). The authors should add more references at this paragraph.</li> <li>3. Introduction. What is the urgency to perform this research? The authors should elaborate the research gap.</li> <li>4. What is the reference or guideline to prepare the extract?</li> <li>5. Line 70-71. Why did the authors use different animal type (mice and rat)?</li> <li>6. The acute toxicity method is quite confusing. "...extract was administered with a single dose, then the same dose were reported 48 hours later on 3 additional animals..." Why did the author repeat the dose administration? Why did the author use 3 additional animals while performing the 14 days observation?</li> <li>7. Is there any intensive observation at the first 24 h after extract administration?</li> <li>8. Line 90. Six group consist of...?</li> <li>9. Line 94-95. The sentences need to be paraphrased.</li> <li>10. Line 176-178. The ALT and AST levels increased two weeks after discontinuation. The authors should explain this phenomenon.</li> <li>11. Figure 2. The color of letter is not consistent, some are black colour and some are white colour.</li> <li>12. Figure 2. It seems there is also enlargement of the glomerular chamber at F, but the authors don't mention about this. Please re-confirm</li> <li>13. Line 241. The authors should double check the statement.</li> <li>14. The discussion is quite lengthy but lack of the supporting information to explain the result. i.e Why the extract posseses moderate toxicity? Waht is the mechanism? How do the authors categorized the toxicity level? What is the chemical content contribute to the toxic effect?</li> <li>15. The discussion is not in line with the result. i.e Line 254. It is mentioned that the the extract doesn't change liver function, but at the result section (Table 7, it is written that the AST level increased significantly at satellite group.</li> <li>16. Conclusion. Line 313. The statement is not in line with discussion and result. It is</li> </ol>	



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

	written that the dose of 400 mg/kg BW doesn't change kidney function, but in discussion (Line 305) it mentioned that the dose of induce kidney damage.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Urip Harahap, Yuandani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia</b>