

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_92312</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Anticonvulsant Activity of Methanol Extract of Harungana.madagascariensis leaf on Mice Model of Isoniazid-induced Seizure.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Although there is wide range of scope and need in the discovery of new antiepileptic drugs by means of synthetic chemistry as well as from natural sources. Here, I am pointing out some general and specific points for the author.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript lacks the quality and in-depth study. The methanol extract may contain hundreds of chemical constituents. There is no study to specify a particular compounds or group of compounds.</li> <li>2. The language used contain several mistakes (typographical and grammatical).</li> <li>3. Abstract must be re-written carefully as most of the headings do not consist required information ie. "The pulverized leaf of <i>H. madagascariensis</i> was extracted using cold maceration and the extract screened for phytoconstituent using the quantitative and qualitative standard methods. The acute toxicity was evaluated by Lorke's method and Anticonvulsant study was carried by the method of Webster and Velluci. Data generated was analyzed statistically using one way ANOVA". <b>The above sentence is not providing any clear information.</b> In Conclusion part of abstract, 'The results obtained from this work suggest that methanolic extract of <i>H. madagascariensis</i> leaves may have anticonvulsant activity, since it delayed the onset of clonic convulsion and abridge the duration of siezure' is not cementing any exclusive result obtained from study.</li> <li>4. Introduction is only containing information about epilepsy, no information on reported pharmacological activity in plant or its specific parts used in study.</li> <li>5. Sect 2.1.1 and 2.1.3 is almost similar.</li> <li>6. In toxicology study, OECD guidelines have not been followed which is very serious issue. Data shown reflects large manipulation.</li> <li>7. In sect 2.1.3. whole paragraph does not yield any meaningful conclusion. ie. Isonaizid (Isonamede, India) and Diazepam were procured from a registered pharmacy store. The stock solution of INH was prepared by dissolving 300 mg of the tablets in 10 ml of distilled water at room temperature. The stock solutions were prepared freshly prior to administration adopted from [11]. Pls write in right and meaningful way.</li> <li>8. <b>Qualitative and qualitative phytochemical phytochemical screening</b> was carried out by method of [12-13]. Again correct the sentence to get significant meaning.</li> <li>9. Group I: Served as normal control and mice in this group received 0.25 ml of 10% Tween 80. – For all the mice of different weight? Why?</li> <li>10. The phytochemical screening was also not yielded any specific information.</li> <li>11. In anticonvulsant study, different doses of extract have shown with less Latency of clonic convulsion than standard but those didn't shown any protection against seizures! How?</li> <li>12. Discussion section is worst . it contain insignificant sentences.</li> <li>13. Conclusion must be clear which is nor there in the manuscript</li> </ol> <p>As per the quality of work reported, the manuscript needs major major revision.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Rajnish Kumar</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Dr. A P J Abdul Kalam Technical University, India</b>