

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJGH_98715
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the hepatotoxic potential of the methanol leaf extract of Lantana camara
Type of the Article	Full length paper

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>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The knowledge the manuscript intends to bring is very important and useful to the scientific community as it focuses on being cautious while using natural products such as herbal medicines</p> <p>2. The title is not suitable as it focuses only on one of the organs studied, the liver, whereas the kidney was also involved. Suggestion_ Evaluation of the hepatotoxic and nephrotoxic potential of the methanol leaf extract of Lantana camara</p> <p>3. Abstract very scanty, no mention of results on urea, creatinine and histopathology analysis, as claimed</p> <p>4. The sections are appropriate but not sequentially arranged, the stages should flow</p> <p>5. The scientific idea is very correct, but there isn't enough results to support it. For instance, there are no reports on the bioactive components of the plants that have been implicated in liver or kidney toxicity. GC_MS analysis of the plant extract coupled with Molecular docking of the bioactive compound against any of the liver and kidney enzymes or ADMET studies would have helped. Besides, results of the histopathology studies were not included. This would help to reveal the level of damage, if any, on both the liver and the kidney cell as a result of exposure to the plant extract</p> <p>6. Reference are not sufficient and not very recent. The most recent is 2015. More recent references should be included</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	There is need for recasting of some of the sentences. I have commented on some of them in the body of the manuscript.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The idea is novel but it seems that the manuscript was written in a haste. The author should take time and improve the discussion area.	

Comment [u1]: the method has no reference, and it is poorly described

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Udu A. Ibiam
Department, University & Country	Evangel University, Nigeria