Iranian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Volume 23 · Issue 1 · e144209

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Sub-chronic Toxicity Study of *Heracleumlasiopetalum* Extract Towards Healthy Sprague Dawley Rats

Enas Sabah Hassan, Heshu Sulaiman Rahman, Shirwan Hamasalih Omer

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
20 Dec 2023	4 Mar 2024	27 Mar 2024	10.5812/ijpr-144209

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 2, Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

2 comments · 3 Feb 2024 – 6 Feb 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 3 Feb 2024

Dear authors,
Your manuscript entitled “Phytochemical Analysis and Sub-Chronic Toxicity Study of Heracleum lasiopetalum Extract towards Healthy Sprague Dawley Rats” was reviewed. In my opinion, the paper has some shortcomings with regard to some results, analyses and text, as outlined below:
Your explanations should be included in the related parts of the manuscript.
For the purpose of your study, why did you choose aerial parts of the plant?
Is there any other research that has investigated the cytotoxic and genotoxic effects of this plant in vitro? It would be helpful if these findings were briefly described in the introduction.
In the introduction section, define your specific research problem and problem statement; summarize existing research to highlight the novelty and contribution of your study.
In the method, which criteria were used to choose the dose administration range?
Please summarize and add your findings and convey the larger implications of your study in the conclusion section.
Good Luck

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 6 Feb 2024

Dear Authors
I read the manuscript carefully. The phytochemical analysis by GC mass is not acceptable. We use GC mass for the identification of some phytochemicals, along with at least one of the following methods: Kowats index, high resolution mass, NMR or CO TLC with standards.
Therefore, this part should be omitted from the text totally.
Because the authors have done a toxicity test, it is suggested that the manuscript be submitted as a short communication without the GC mass parts.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Chief Editor,

Thanks very much for your and the Reviewer's valuable comments and for allowing us to submit a revised draft of the manuscript. Here are the responses point by point. We appreciate the time and effort you and the reviewers dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript.

Associate Editor	**Comment**	**Answer**
	The phytochemical analysis by GC mass is not acceptable. We use GC mass to identify some phytochemicals using GC mass, and at least one of the following methods, including Kowats index, high-resolution mass, NMR or CO TLC with standards. Therefore, this part should be omitted from the text. Because of this, the authors have done a toxicity test, and it is suggested that the manuscript be submitted as short communication without GC mass parts.	Dear Reviewer, thanks for the comment. We have removed the phytochemical analysis part of the manuscript. However, we have depended on papers in reputable journals to do phytochemical analyses such as Gomathi D, Kalaiselvi M, Ravikumar G, Devaki K, and Uma C. GC-MS analysis of bioactive compounds from the whole plant ethanolic extract of Evolvulus alsinoides (L.) L. Journal of food science and technology. 2015;52:1212-7. Thanks
Reviewer 1	Your explanations should be included in the related parts of the manuscript. For your study, why did you choose aerial parts of the plant?	Dear Reviewer, thanks for the comment; the central part of the plant is a leaf that we used for our study. The people use the leaves for cooking. I am so sorry we have used the word aerial mistakenly.  Thanks
	Is there any other research that has investigated this plant's cytotoxic and genotoxic effects in vitro? It would be helpful if these findings were briefly described in the introduction.	Dear Reviewer, thanks for the comment; to date, we have not found any research on this plant neither in vitro or in vivo. Thanks
	In the introduction section, define your specific research problem and problem statement. Summarize existing research to highlight the novelty and contribution of your study.	Dear Reviewer, thanks for the comment. We have added the required information to the methodology section (Page 2, Lines 48-51 Yellow Highlights). Thanks
	In the method, which criteria were used to choose the dose administration range?	Dear Reviewer, thanks for the comment. We have added the required information to the methodology section (Page 3, Lines 69-70, Yellow Highlights). Thanks
	Please summarize and add your findings and convey the more significant implications of your study in the conclusion section.	Dear Reviewer, thanks for the comment; we have added the required information (Page 3, Lines 270-274, Yellow Highlights). Thanks

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 24 Mar 2024 – 24 Mar 2024

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 24 Mar 2024

Thank you for making the revisions and removing the GC mass part. I think the article could be published at this stage.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 24 Mar 2024

Thanks for making the revisions.