

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_105547
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute and Sub-chronic toxicity evaluation of the ethanolic extract of Coula edulis B., (Olacaceae) stem bark
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have gone through the entire manuscript. This work is interesting and important for scientific community, but there are some queries and comments that should be addressed by authors. 2. The title of the article is suitable 3. The Abstract of the article is comprehensive. However, I have suggestions for this section: All abbreviations should be presented in full and the abbreviation in parenthesis when appearing for the first time. As an example, in the abstract "OECD" should be mentioned in brackets when it first appears. The authors should add the estimated lethal dose 50 (LD₅₀) to the abstract. "As would be expected, exposure to CEE did not cause significant toxic effects in treated rats. However, this plant extract can be safely recommended for therapeutic use". "Therefore" would be more appropriate here instead of "however" 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate In materials and methods section, it would be interesting for the authors to provide the ethics committee approval number, if any. In the results section, the titles of tables 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 mentioned a sub-chronic administration, while the study refers to sub-acute toxicity. In the discussion section, the references in parentheses should be deleted. The numbers in brackets are sufficient. The following paragraph is not necessary because the phytochemicals have not been measured or isolated: "In the same vein, note that flavonoids and isoflavonoids such as genistein [32] (Huang et al., 2013), quercetin [33] (Janbaz et al., 2004) and luteolin [34] (Lee et al., 2011) have shown effects protectors on the liver in rodents by significantly reducing or inhibiting the elevation of plasma". transaminase levels." "Despite being the largest of the glands, the liver is one of the organs most affected by a substance's toxicity. By acting as a censor for any molecule absorbed from the intestinal lumen, the liver is exposed to a daily alteration that is sometimes irreversible. That said, it is therefore logical that the liver tissue samples were selected as part of the histological analyses. Although the observation of the histological sections of the liver showed minor changes in the number and the staining of the hepatic sinusoids, it goes without saying that it is more the absence of lesions at the level of the hepatic tissues of the exposed rats to treatment that commands attention." This paragraph would be more appropriate in the discussion The errors or lack of punctuations must be corrected in the conclusion and throughout the text. 5. I think that the manuscript is scientifically correct. 	

Review Form 1.7

	6- The references are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are some typos and grammatical errors that should be corrected.	
Optional/General 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:	Belem-Kabre Wendkouni Leila Marie Esther
Department, University & Country	Institut de Recherche en Sciences de la Santé, Burkina Faso