



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJPR_20418
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of preventive effectiveness of <i>Nigella sativa</i> L. against rat kidney stones, generated by ethylene glycol
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The authors have evaluated the potential utility of <i>Nigella sativa</i> in urinary oxalate stones. The authors conclude that the investigated compound has therapeutic potential. However, the way the results are currently presented do not seem to justify this conclusion. It is possible that the authors are justified in their conclusions but the way the data is currently presented is not very convincing. The description of methodology as well as results is very sketchy. It would be more useful to the reader if the manuscript is written with greater clarity. The discussion is very long and at places it is speculative. It would be better if the authors shorten the discussion and concentrate on discussion of their own findings rather than going into speculative explanations about the mechanisms that might be involved or not.</p> <p>While the language of the paper has improved from the previous version, it still leaves a lot to be desired to make it acceptable for a scientific publication in an English language publication.</p> <p>Some specific issues are detailed below.</p> <p>Methods:</p> <p>2.3 After that, the mixture was filtered and concentrated under reduced pressure at 35°C.</p> <p>To what degree was the concentration done and was it standardized?</p> <p>2.4.3 and 2.4.4</p> <p>'In addition to 1 percent Ethylene Glycol, 1 ml of <i>Nigella sativa</i> L. orally (alongside 750 mg/kg <i>Nigella sativa</i> L. powder) were administered' ... Not clear...does this mean that 1 ml of the extract and 750mg/kg of the powder were administered orally? If so, what is the reasoning for doing this?</p> <p>2.8</p> <p>It is mentioned that after removal the kidneys were put in formalin and then sections were made. What was the time frame for this? Was it done immediately?</p> <p>3.1.1</p> <p>'The number of Oxalate crystals was 28 in 10 microscopic fields, which acquire significant increase in comparison with group A (P<0.001).'</p> <p>Is this the absolute value (28 in 10 microscopic fields) or the mean value per field?</p>	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

3.1.2

Therefore, it was indicated that in this group, the number and the size of crystals were higher and more variegated in comparison with the statistical reports of other groups which were administered through negative control procedures. However, it did not acquire any statistical significance over the latter.

These sentences are vague. Need to be written more clearly.

The values in groups C and D (23.8 ± 4.609 and 12.8 ± 3.732) are given as means values while for Group B only as '28'. This needs to be consistent. Moreover while the difference between groups C and D may not be statistically significant (obviously due to the large Standard Errors) the mean value in group D is almost half of the value in group C. Would it become statistically if the "n" was greater? Further, why no comparison was made between Group B and Group D? Assuming that the value mentioned for Group B (28) is the mean value, the difference between this and Group D is still greater and might be significant.

3.2 and 3.3

These sections are very vague. **No data is provided.** Need to be written more succinctly with at least some data. (alternatively the data can be provided in a table)

3.4

The average weight of kidneys was 2.81 ± 0.26 g, indicating that they were heavier than the ones in the positive group, which acquired 1.73 ± 0.07 g average kidney weight.

The average weight " 2.81 ± 0.26 " .. which group does it refer to?

'The most important finding of the present study is the fact that *Nigella sativa* acquires therapeutic effectiveness against Calcium Oxalate in the preventive research group.'

The results mention that the difference between Groups B and C were not statistically significant then how can the above conclusion be drawn?

Once the results are re-evaluated. The discussion will need to be modified accordingly.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Monash University, Malaysia