

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_79333
Title of the Manuscript:	Phytochemical Profile and Haematological Indices in Toxicity Studies of Maerua angolensis and Gliricidia sepium Leaves Extracts
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:

(<https://www.journalijr2h.com/index.php/IJR2H/editorial-policy>)

[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	<p>Both <i>G. sepium</i> and <i>M. angolensis</i> leaves extracts showed the presence of varieties of medicinal phytochemicals. Seasonal variations have little effect on their quantities and plants harvested during the wet season housed more phytochemicals than that of the dry season. Therefore, the authors studied the phytochemical profile of <i>G. sepium</i> and <i>M. angolensis</i> and their haematological interference in Wistar rats during acute and subacute toxicity testing.</p> <p>The topic is interesting and can provide useful information for further research.</p> <p>The paper is written relatively well. It is written on nineteen pages, four of which contain references. The manuscript is well documented with the results of the study properly processed in 7 tables. The data obtained were analyzed using the statistical package for social science (SPSS) for Windows, version 21.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) and represented as Mean±SEM. Student T-test at 95% confidence interval was used to evaluate the significance of the difference between the mean values of the measured parameters in the respective test and control groups. A mean difference was considered significant at $p < 0.05$.</p> <p>On the basis of the results of the present study, the authors came to the conclusion that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- both <i>G. sepium</i> and <i>M. angolensis</i> leaves extracts showed the presence of varieties of medicinal phytochemicals- seasonal variations have little effect on their quantities and plants harvested during the wet season housed more phytochemicals than that of the dry season- the haematological profiles were not affected during the acute and subacute toxicity evaluation- <i>G. sepium</i> rather boosted the blood production by increasing the population of the circulating erythrocytes and red cell indices <p>The article can be edited after major revision according to comments to the authors.</p> <p><u>Content suggestions:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Why did the authors select especially these drugs ?2. The authors stated that the results increased the population of the circulating erythrocytes and red cell indices. However, how can they explain the influence of the administrations of the studied herbs on the WBC profile, especially lymphocytes, as documented by the Table 4, 6 and 7.<ol style="list-style-type: none">3. It is a pity that the authors did not include more probands in the study to obtain more powerful results.4. I sincerely appreciate the effort of the authors to properly describe identification and quantification of the particular herbs in the section Materials and Methods.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. These are extracts that currently in use at the tradomedical centres. We chose to research on them to unravel the benefit or otherwise of their phytoconstituents.2. WBC has defence function and their sudden mobilization on notice of invaders could define their values at any time of the study. This has been explained in the discussion session.

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No