

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_103604</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PRECLINICAL RESEARCH TOOL INNOVATION IN RESOURCE-SCARCE SETTING – A CASE STUDY OF A MOUSE ANXIETY MULTI-TEST APPARATUS</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.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b> If you explained in simple manner which would have been good and include some advantages and disadvantages of developed apparatus over the conventional apparatus</p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>How you conclude the U. of A. mouse anxiety multi-test apparatus is effective in preclinical research in anxiolytic drug discovery</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The aim of the study is not defined.</p> <p>You were not explained the case in order to prove the newly developed apparatus suitable for the evaluation of anxiolytic property.</p> <p>You have only described the theoretical aspects necessary to prove the apparatus is suitable for preclinical studies.</p> <p>If you take one study that was conducted using conventional apparatus to assess preclinical anxiolytic activity, then compare the advantages of developing apparatus for such a study.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The apparatus is worth it in the anxiolytic drug discovery process.</p> <p>If you included the animals in this study to prove the efficacy of the developed apparatus, then your research work would have been appreciated.</p>	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>U. S. Jijith</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Govt. Medical College, India</b>