

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_81476
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute and subchronic toxicities of the aqueous extract of the Hymenocardia acida roots in rodents
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.journalejmp.com/index.php/EJMP/editorial-policy>)

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>Abstract has not been written perfectly. Abstract is the essence of the whole writing. please write a summary of the important results, then write a brief conclusion from the results obtained in this study.</p> <p>Some statements are confusing. Please state and explain in a simple sentences and understandable reader.</p> <p>There were no significant changes in serum urea, uric acid and creatinine at 500 and 1000 mg/kg BW in males and females compared to controls Please present the data</p> <p>Histopathological measurement have not been discussed. Please add</p> <p>please write and explain in the discussion, from which results it can be concluded that there are cardiovascular, hepatoprotective and protective kidney effects. Indeed, the subchronic toxicity test performed did not cause any changes in the histopathology of the kidneys and liver, but from that fact, can it be concluded that it has a protective effect? please kindly make a brief conclusion based only from the current result. Thank you</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Please revised the discussion	
Optional/General comments	This is actually an interesting study. However, it needs some important revisions to make this article worthy of publication. Conclusions must be clear and concluded based on the results obtained from this study and not based on the author's assumptions, conclusions should not be written according to a theoretical framework. thx	

Comment [G1]: Please present the data. Thank you

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Meilinah Hidayat
Department, University & Country	Universitas Kristen Maranatha, Indonesia