

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_108572
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute and Chronic Toxicological Assessment of the Aqueous Extract of Khaya senegalensis (Desr.) A. Juss.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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. Yes, Acute and subchronic toxicity of aqueous extract of roots of Khaya senegalensis (Desr.) A. Juss in mice and rats respectively. 2. Partially yes, Title is not covering test system and type of extract (roots). Need modification by including the above two. 3. No, Methodology mentioned is not correct. It says general statement by combining acute and subchronic. Both are different test systems. Need modification along with comprehensive results. 4. Yes 5. Partially yes, but results such as clinical signs and histopathology lesions should be justified with proper interlink with other correlative changes and literature reference which is almost similar. Acute toxicity in mice was conducted without following any proper guidelines. If guideline like OECD no. 423 used, LD50 can be derived with limited number of animals (maximum using 15 animals). More number of animals were used. Subchronic toxicity performed in single sex of animals, justification was not provided for using single sex. LD50 was determined in mice and used for determining doses for rat repeated dose toxicity. May be the test extract may be safe in rats, one research article says aqueous extract of stem safe at 2000 mg/kg b.w. in rats. 6. References related to histopathology lesions related to similar synthetic products. 7. Aqueous extract of roots was tested. In humans, how much was regular usage not mentioned (at least approximate amount used for treatment in short and long span, based on which the toxicity can be correlated) 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	-	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Satyavani Godavarthi
Department, University & Country	India