



SDI Review Form 1.6

N

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	2015_JAMPS_18361
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute and Subacute Toxicological Assessment of the Aqueous Extract of the Aerial Parts of <i>Eremomastax speciosa</i> (Acanthaceae) in Wistar Rats
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Phytochemical analysis were cited [13]. It evaluated an aqueous crude extract of <i>E. speciosa</i> sample from another source. How are the authors sure that this aqueous extract has the same chemical profile? The discussion about the contribution of the suggested compounds in the effects observed were not done. Some compounds described in the reference [13] can be toxic and contributes in the modification of hematologic parameters. This paper aims to the investigations of possible toxic effects and the safety level in mammalian model. Its can not be done if the extract composition are only suggested in a different sample. The chemical profile are modified when you obtain the same plant from different sources. The seasonality should be considered in a paper that evaluates a crude plant extract. This phenomenon includes so many factors that modify chemical composition among plants of same species. Some Standard Deviation are too large in some haematological parameters. The statistic analysis review are strongly recommended in all data.	The work cited in reference (13) refers to the authors Amang AP, Tan PV, Nkwengoua E, and Nyasse B. in the same laboratory. The Corresponding author Prof TAN PV is the Supervisor and team chief investigator. Thanks. The Discussion has been edited to take this comment into account (see Page 9, Paragraph 2). The reviewer is right. Fortunately, this work was carried out in the same laboratory, on the same sample, by two different students (Gaël Tchokomeni Siwe, main author of present manuscript, and Amang AP, main author of reference (13)). Both research students are supervised by Prof Tan PV (Corresponding author). The authors are very grateful. Some grave errors were made in the placement of decimal points. Corrections have been made and highlighted in haematological parameters
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The aqueous extract preparation parameters should be referenced. An aqueous extract may be obtained	We have not before and did not see any need to reference a standard procedure which we have



SDI Review Form 1.6

	from different protocols, why the authors utilized the described ones?	used for years for the preparation of aqueous extracts.
Optional/General comments	The paper has good scientific value and the results are important thus the popular uses of <i>E. speciosa</i> aqueous extract. It may contribute to the safety uses of this plant.	