### 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)

### PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer's comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Compulsory REVISION comments**                                                 | - The introduction section is poorly written. Revise English language, paragraph structure, and is not concise and clear.  
- Why these doses were chosen? 50 and 500 and 2000 mg/kg? In fact, it is more common to choose doses which are the double of the last one, so 1000 mg/kg would be better.  
- Which were the protocols of OECD for sub chronic toxicity followed? If these were followed, these doses regimen would not be allowed. This is mandatory for the publication, as research Ethics with animals are involved.  
- Page 4, line 89: what was the route of administration? What were the volumes?  
- Page 4, Line 92: how were animal euthanized? Do not use sacrifice, it is unpolite speech.  
- Page 6, Line 126: You say Necropsy of rats in group 1, 2, 3 showed normal livers and kidneys, but do not specify the sizes and the statistical analysis.  
- Page 6, Line 134: the discussion is very poor, very short length. It must be extended. The citation of author [4] is not adequate.  
- Page 7, Line 153: Authors say The alteration in RBCs and Hb may be due to defective haematopoiesis inhibited erythropoiesis or increase in destruction of red blood cells. What may be causing this?  
- The conclusion is poorly written, revise English. |
| **Minor REVISION comments**                                                       | - Plant material: what is the voucher number and who identified the species.  
- Animals: which were the international regulations followed? |
| **Optional/General comments**                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
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