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Reviewer’s report:

Comments on the manuscript entitled: “Protection and toxicity evaluation of ethyl gallate from Acacia nilotica (L.) on biological macromolecules and albino wistar rats" are:

In general, the research constitutes a useful contribution to the field and well prepared.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? yes
3. Are the data sound? yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? yes

Discretionary Revisions (Recommended comments):

- Addition of the name of the author (L.) each time after the plant name especially in figures and the table.
- Addition of the range of normalcy in page 15.

Minor Essential Revisions: (the corrections are highlighted in the manuscript)

- Page 5, line 6: under "Plant material and extraction": It was mentioned "in our previous report [7]---------please check this no. it is wrong.
- Page 6, line 1: add "solvents separately like...."
- Page 6, line 9: under "Protein damage assay": gel ----- Gel (correction)
- Page 7, line 2: under "DNA interaction by FTIR and UV analysis": HCL----HCl
(correction)
- Page 8, line 1: under "Animals": mention the no. of rats used.
- Page 10, line 7: under "Results and discussion": the same mention plant
- Please check the references no.:
  # There are mistakes in no. 4 – 7.
  # Ref. 10 and 12 (exchange of letters; 2010a for ref. 10 and 2010b for ref. 12.
  # Ref. 18 and 19 have to be interchanged "Lee et al for 19 and "Laemmli et al for
  18; as in text.
  # Ref. 20; not italic
  # Ref. 34 Chin is capital.
  # Ref. 36 the name of the journal is italic.
- Table 1: DMRT: to be clarified in the footnote without abbreviations.
- Resolution of fig. 3 & 4 to be improved.

Major Compulsory Revisions:
- The authors didn't mention any reported work on toxicity: the following is an example:
  Al-Mustafa ZH1, Dafallah AA.; "A study on the toxicology of Acacia nilotica"; Am
- The last paragraph in page 12, starting with "Second – order, needs more
  clarification, it is not compatible with figures 5 & 6.

A question to the authors:
Why you choose only ethyl gallate and not other antioxidants phenolic
compounds present in the plant?
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