

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_99054
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Rohypnol on pain threshold and acoustic startle reflex in Wistar rats
Type of the Article	

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://journalsarjnp.com/index.php/SARJNP/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. There are minor errors in the text that need to be fixed.</p> <p>2. Writing the text of the article should be completely scientific.</p> <p>3. The introduction of the article is long.</p> <p>4. The reason for conducting this study and justify why this study is important, should be explained in detail in the final paragraph of the article.</p> <p>5. What is the reason for choosing female rats in this study?</p> <p>6. The code of ethics should be included in the article in the relevant section.</p> <p>7. How to treat the animals and how to receive the substances of interest should be determined (abstract and method)</p> <p>8. Comparison of different study days requires repeated measure analysis. Use Tukey's instead of LSD.</p> <p>9. Check the normality of the data.</p> <p>10. The results are reported in the discussion section of the article!!!</p> <p>11. The weakest part of the paper is the discussion, which needs major rewriting</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beydolah Shahouzei
Department, University & Country	Cardiovascular Research Center, Institute of Basic and Clinical Physiology Sciences, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Iran