

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_91698
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF URTICA AESTUANS EXTRACT ON ULCER INDICES AND HISTOLOGY OF INDOMETHACIN INDUCED GASTRIC TOXICITY
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:

(<https://journalirjgh.com/index.php/IRJGH/editorial-policy> )

## 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstract: The abstract needs to be revised to include essential components as listed.</li> <li>Introduction:</li> <li>Materials and Methods Preparation of extract: The solvent used to prepare the extract needs to be stated. Choice of dose of extract. Ethical approval for the study</li> <li>Results The figures need description and explanation.</li> <li>Discussion</li> <li>References</li> </ol>	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number of rats and the groups are not correct. The authors mentioned 5groups of six rats but the groups are six. This needs to be corrected.</li> <li>The dose of administration of the extracts and parameters that were measured needs to be mentioned in the abstract.</li> <li>Please state the ulcer indicators.</li> </ol> <p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>Introduction is very shallow. The information on the plant needs to be expanded with current literature. Check the correct scientific name. Laportea and not Laportae. Laportea aestuans is a better name that is available in literature and I suggest that this name should be preferred to Urtica aestuans. Also include the common local names.</p> <p>The link between the ulcer and the plant has not been included in the introduction. This should be included.</p> <p><b>Materials and method:</b></p> <p>The method of extract preparation, solvent used, and quantity of the leaves used should be explained. Experimental design: Check the grouping and number of animals used in the study. Please clarify on the choice of the dose of the extract. It is not clear whether the extract was administered to groups after administration of indomethacin. Please clarify on the extract and indomethacin induced ulcer. <b>Gastric juice:</b> "the rats were put to death" please use the correct scientific expression to this sentence. How was the gastric juice collected? "The gastric juice content was mixed with 5ml of distilled water" What volume of gastric juice was mixed? Mean ulcer index: Provide a correct reference on the method you followed. Statistics: Check the accepted level of significance. Accepting the p value higher than 0.05 is not appropriate.</p> <p><b>Results</b></p> <p>Figures 1 and 2 should be redrawn to show different groups using different colours. Plates should be converted into figures as figures 3a-f and so on. There are no descriptions for the figures and the photomicrographs. This should be provided. There are no descriptions to the labels on the plates SM, DM etc, no magnification, no indication on the mucosa.</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>Paragraph 1: There is no macroscopic evidence in this study therefore the sentence should be reframed. Paragraph 2: There is no evidence of antioxidant enzymes and ROS in the results presented. Hence the authors should show evidence if any or relate the results to relevant studies on plants phytochemicals and ROS inhibition. Paragraph 4: the main phytochemicals---- There is no result on phytochemistry. The authors should check results in literature to use and support their argument.</p> <p><b>References</b></p> <p>The references do not conform with the journal format. Please correct the references to the correct journal style.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Discussion</b></p>	<p>The discussion is not coherent. This section should be revised.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p> <p>English language editing</p>	<p>The manuscript needs English language editing for correct expression and use of scientific language.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Daniel U. Owu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Calabar, Nigeria</b>