



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAMPS_15776
Title of the Manuscript:	ACUTE TOXICITY STUDY AND WOUND HEALING EFFECT OF THE ACETONE FRACTION OF <i>Tetrapleura tetraptera</i> FRUIT IN EXCISION WOUND MODEL
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript entitled " ACUTE TOXICITY STUDY AND WOUND HEALING EFFECT OF THE ACETONE FRACTION OF Tetrapleura tetraptera FRUIT IN EXCISION WOUND MODEL " presents results concerning the acetone fraction of Tetrapleura tetraptera FRUIT on wound healing activity. The following points should be taken into account: 1. Tetrapleura tetraptera FRUIT is used among people dairy life for decades. Authors IP injected the acetone fraction relative the high concentration (10 g/kg v.s. 0.4~0.6 g/ml topical used) does mean nonsense. The experimental design obfuscates the main discussing issue. They extracted the dry herbal by different methods (aqueous v.s. organic), treated animal in different routes (IP v.s. topical), and the concentration used in g/kg v.s. g/ml amount figure 1 and figure 2 are also confused and not elucidated. 2. Authors must reconsider the treatment design in wound healing study such as included acetone in negative group as well as Neobacin in solution format , plus describe the sample applied/dissolved method. 3. The manuscript must be reviewed and amended clearly in the abstract section as the statement at line 14 is incorrect. 4. Please describe clearly the calculation of wound area, why multiply factor 10 in this formula? Please provide the pictures of healing at different days to display the inflammation or reepithelium.	Actually, the comment is not well stated but if it is about the dose administered being low in relative to the LD₅₀, previous works on topical application of <i>Tetrapleura tetraptera</i> had always been with low dose infact in our previous work (Effiong et al., 2014) on the aqueous fraction of this plant; high dose application showed a significant decrease in wound healing effect. That is why low doses were used. The experimental design has been corrected in the revised copy to correspond with the discussion. Figure 1 and figure 2 are two different process; fig. 1 refers to the acute toxicity study while fig.2 is on the wound healing effect so their treatment routes and concentrations will definitely be different. 2. The treatment design in wound healing study such as included acetone in negative group has been reconsidered, the sample applied and its dissolution method has also been described in the revised copy. The Neobacin was used in its powder form (not in solution form) and its sample is described in the introduction section. 3. The manuscript has reviewed and amended clearly the statement of line 14 in the abstract section. 4. The formula for the calculation of wound area has been described clearly and factor 10 is rather a dividing factor and not a multiplying factor. The



SDI Review Form 1.6

		pictures of healing at different days have been provided to display the inflammation or reepithelium.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		