

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_115213
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the anti-inflammatory effects of methanol extract of Rauwofia vomitera leaves (MERVL) using in-vivo based assays.
Type of the Article	Research

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. The topic of manuscript is interesting, important for scientific community. 2. The title of the article is suitable. 3. The abstract is not comprehensive: group 1 is named "untreated", but it is not given the information about addition of egg albumin in this group. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - numeration of subsections is not normal: 3.1; 3.2.1; 3.3. Where is 3.2? - 3.5 is a numeration of 2 sections both: <i>Effect of methanol extract on lipid peroxidation and antioxidant status of rats in Egg albumin- induced inflammation and Effect of methanol extract on lipid peroxidation and antioxidant status of rats in Egg albumin- induced inflammation.</i> 5. The manuscript is not correct scientifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In <i>Methods</i> (as it mentioned in point 3 above) group 1 is named "untreated", but it is not given the information about addition of egg albumin in this group; - Group 2 is named «Received 10 mg/kg body weight of indomethacin (standard drug)» иbut there is no information about addition of egg albumin firstly - and the same for other groups (3-5) 6. The references are not sufficient. The list of references is built absolutely incorrect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - № 2, 8, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19 are formatted incorrectly; - № 10, 14 and 23 are the links for the same reference (Celestine, UO., Keneolisa, AF., Chigozie, UUU., Lilian, AC., Jude, Al., Maduabuchi, OR. and Assumpta, AC. Membrane Stabilization, PhospholipaseA2, Albumin Denaturation, Protease Inhibition, as Viable Mechanisms for the Anti-Inflammatory Effects of Methanol Extract of Rauwolfia vomitoria Afzel Leaves. <i>Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry</i>, (2023). 13(3), 57-65.); - № 12 and 13 are the links for the Opeyemi A, Adeoye O, Adebajji A, Olawumi J. CREM, PRM I and II gene expression in Wistar rats testes treated with antipsychotic drugs: Chlorpromazine, Rauwolfia vomitoria and co-administration of reserpine, zinc and ascorbic acid. <i>JBRA Assisted Reproduction</i>. 2021;25(1): 97.; - № 18 and 19 are the links for the Winter EA, Nuss GV. Inflammatory and antipyretic activities of indomethacin. <i>J Pharmacol Exp Ther</i>. 1962;141:369-76. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Language quality of the article is not suitable enough(edoema, Rauowfia), text of article is written carelessly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - in Abstract group 1 is named Untreated but in Experimental Design it is named Toxic 	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Introduction Carrageenan is mentioned as an edema inducer, but the methods do not mention its use in the experiment. And why talk about it in the introduction not in Methods?</p> <p>2. In the Methods section, the full Latin name of Rauwolfia and the family to which it belongs to should be given.</p> <p>3. The Methods section provides information about the number and weight of mice used in the experiment, but there is no information about their gender.</p> <p>4. The Experimental Design section (2.5) shows that a TOTAL of 30 rats were used - 5 groups of 6 rats each. However, section 2.7 (Leucocytes Mobilization Test in Rats) shows the use of 25 rats - 5 groups of 5 rats. If this is an additional group, then this information should be added to section 2.5.</p> <p>5. In the same section (2,7) is given «Three hours after the animals in the appropriate groups (n=5) received oral dosages of the extracts, tween 80, and reference medicines, each animal had an intraperitoneal injection of 0.5 ml of a 3% w/v agar solution(of what?) in normal saline.»</p> <p>6. In section 3.2.1 (Quantitative and qualitative phytochemical composition of methanol extract of R. vomitoria leaves), Table 1 does not indicate the number of "n" - how can data from different groups be compared without this information? - In section 3.4 (Effect of Methanol Extract of R. vomitoria on Egg Albumin induced paw edema) «Group treated with 100mg/kg b.w significantly (P <0.05) lowered the inflammation when compared to <u>normal control</u> and the extract reduced the inflammation with percentage inhibition of 43% at <u>5hr.</u>» but difference described p<0,05 is not significant, and results are discussing at 5 hours but in the table there are 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 and 12 hours. Also in this sentence group 1 is named as a normal control but it is not normal because it is a group of rats gotted egg albumin (or untreated group - like in Abstract or toxic group - like in Experimental Desigh). - In what units are present data in the Table 3? This information has to be added to the content of Table 3. - Table 3: difference in data of group1 and group 2 appears just after 2 hours from the start of experiment; numeration by abcde is uncleared - what corresponds to each letter? - Table 3: difference between 1, 2 and 3 groups' data is not statistically reliable neither for 0 hour, nor for 1 hour - and unlikely for 4 hours - despite on that in the table reliability in this groups is given. It is not possible for these value of data and for n = 4.</p> <p>7. Section 3.5: what methods were used for detection of SOD, MDA, GSH and CAT? This information is absent in section Methods. Also uncoding of all abbreviations is necessary.</p> <p>8. - Table 3.5 - uncoding of abbreviation TLC is absent.</p> <p>9. Discussion: very small, unconvincing. One sentence is senseless (not finished): «Numerous nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory medications (NSAIDs), including aspirin and indomethacin»</p> <p>10. Conclusion. On the base of noticed remarks conclusions are not convincing.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olha Storchylo
Department, University & Country	Odessa National Medical University, Ukraine