

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_127071
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF <i>PARSONSIA STRAMINEA</i> (R.Br) F. MUEL STEM BARK TOXICOLOGICAL IMPACT ON THE LIVER IN MICE
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This research contributes to the safe use of traditional herbal medicines by assessing the potential liver toxicity of <i>P. straminea</i> in mice. It helps determine the safe dosage range in mice and offers preliminary information for future research on humans. However, further research is needed to complete and confirm these findings by ensuring human safety.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	A) From Title: - Remove "O" within TOXICOLOGICAL word. - However, the Title is not scientifically concise!! "ASSESSMENT OF <i>PARSONSIA STRAMINEA</i> (R.Br) F. MUEL STEM BARK TOXICOLOGICAL IMPACT ON THE LIVER IN MICE" Proposed option: "HEPATOTOXICOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF <i>PARSONSIA STRAMINEA</i> (R.Br.) F. MUELL. STEM BARK CRUDE ETHANOLIC EXTRACT IN MICE"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract structure is ok. However, from this; 0.2ml/kg ; precise which product?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Okay.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This research contains scientific robustness because the findings are precise and correct. However, the process of achieving an optimal risk assessment level has been incomplete.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Okay.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The general scientific language is okay. However, as specified in many parts of the work, there are a lot of grammatical errors and punctuation! Need grammar service edition help.	
Optional/General comments	- The subacute studies may align with the OECD-407 guidelines and other relevant requirements that were not followed at all. - An in vivo subacute investigation, which includes a histopathological evaluation of mainly the liver and kidneys, involves a monthly repetitive oral dose to assess long-term harmful effects for various aspects such as physical signs and behaviours, haematological risk, and main biochemical parameter risks. - To ensure the drug's distribution throughout the entire body and potential toxic risk, the test should also evaluate the macroscopic risk level of other organs, such as the heart, spleen, brain, and lungs, based on the macroscopic organ index. - Although the current study is only partially complete, it may open up new possibilities for completing subacute studies of the same plant extract. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mboneye Anselme
Department, University & Country	Southern Medical University, China, National Institute for Public Health, Burundi