

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Biotechnology Journal International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BJI_123067</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>INVESTIGATION OF THE ACUTE TOXICITY AND <i>In vivo</i> ANTIDIARRHOEAL ACTIVITY OF THE ETHANOL EXTRACT AND FRACTIONS OF <i>Ipomoea triloba</i> BY MODEL INFECTION AND PROTECTION TESTS IN MICE AGAINST SELECTED CLINICAL DIARRHOEAGENIC BACTERIAL ISOLATES</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</b>

### [Review Form 3](#)

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This study has aimed to discuss the acute toxicity and antidiarrhoeal properties of <i>Ipomoea triloba</i> , making it a valuable contribution to ethnopharmacology and pharmaceutical microbiology. The study design used integrated microbiological assays with <i>in vivo</i> testing, a really powerful approach to understand both the efficacy and safety profile of the plant extract. These, and the particularly high degree of reduction in antagonistic bacterial activity after plasmid curing, give reason for optimism regarding the potential of <i>I. triloba</i> as an antibacterial agent against infectious diarrhea. Although detailed, this study would have a better conclusion by elaborating more on the mechanism of action of the extract taken from the plant. More importantly, discussion about some limitations in the study—a relatively small sample size or specificity of bacterial strains tested—could be included. Isolation and identification of active compounds in <i>Ipomoea triloba</i> would definitely be one of those future research steps that would really be necessary to validate its use clinically.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive in covering the essential aspects of the study, including the aim, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, there are a few areas where it could be improved:</p> <p>Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarity on Study Design: While the study design mentions the collection of clinical stool samples, it could benefit from a brief mention of how these samples were processed or how the organisms were isolated to give a clearer picture of the initial steps.</li> <li>2. Importance on Key Findings: The abstract could highlight the significance of the reduction in antagonistic activity post-plasmid curing. This is a critical finding that shows the potential for <i>Ipomoea triloba</i> in overcoming bacterial resistance, and emphasizing this more could enhance the impact.</li> <li>3. Inclusion of Specific Data Points: The abstract provides percentages related to protection efficacy, but including the exact protection rates of the ethanol extract versus the control in the results section could make it clearer for the reader to appreciate the magnitude of the findings.</li> <li>4. Rationale for Further Studies: The conclusion mentions the need for further studies but could briefly state why identifying active principles is crucial for clinical application. This addition would provide a stronger justification for future research.</li> <li>5. Potential Deletion: The abstract includes a very detailed breakdown of the activity index profile (AIP) results. This level of detail might be excessive for an abstract and could be summarized more broadly to focus on the overall outcome (e.g., "The ethanol extract showed a reduction in antagonistic activity and an increase in protective efficacy after plasmid curing.").</li> </ol> <p>By making these adjustments, the abstract would become more focused, impactful, and accessible to readers .</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically strong and technically faultless on a number of grounds. First, the study employed well-established methodologies in antibiogram testing, plasmid curing, and intraperitoneal acute toxicity tests that would be commensurate for the assessment of bacterial resistance and safety profiling of plant extracts. The extent of the results presented, wherein control groups were used and LD50 values calculated, also guarantees credibility and reproducibility of the findings. Attention has been paid both to the efficacy and safety of <i>Ipomoea triloba</i>, an approach balanced in light of possible therapeutic use in pharmacological research.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	

### Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language and English quality are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is clear, concise, and uses technical terminology appropriately with regard to scientific standards.</p> <p>However, minor areas need to be revised for better readability and clarity. For example, by refining sentence structure and maintaining consistency in the use of tenses so that it would be easy to follow and understand easily. However, the quality of the language is good enough to understand the findings of the research it conveys and suffices for academic needs.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Nil This manuscript is quite good but may need a few revisions in order to be clearer and more detailed in presentation.</p>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>		

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>S. M. Shaheedha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Crescent School of Pharmacy, India</b>