

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_95587
Title of the Manuscript:	Ashwagandha and its active ingredient, withanolide A, increase phosphorylation of TrkB in cultured hippocampal neurons
Type of the Article	Experimental (Bench) research

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	Yes  Yes  Yes  Needs correction  Yes  Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Good	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1. <b>Correct the numerous grammatical and spelling mistakes in the manuscript.</b> 2. <b>Source of funding is not mentioned anywhere in the manuscript. Please give details about your funding source?</b> 3. <b>Results and discussion section has to be simplified, rephrased and rewritten as it is indecipherable, I could not make any sense out of it.</b> 4. <b>Use flowcharts to simplify your synthesis, rather than employing descriptive narration.</b> 5. <b>"Figure Captions:" section be placed near the end of the paper</b>	

### 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 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Santhosh Kumar Rajamani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Maharashtra University of Health Sciences, India</b>