

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>)

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>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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No apply.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>It is an interesting manuscript about the effect of Rhoypnol on pain and reflexes in Rats. The article is well written and described; and it merit to be published. However, please consider the following comments and suggestions before acceptance from my side: i) in the abstract is suggested the addition of some mention about the methodology, volumes of administration. Maybe consider this comment for material and methods. ii) The discussion and conclusions are too short. However there is a lot of analysis about mechanism of action. In this regard please check the section of results and complete adding more justifications. iii) and from the previous point, generate more conclusions. iv) check the position and order of the different section. v) in the section of results there is a lot of data in tables and graphs; but there is not any real probe of the work developed. So, please consider to add some measurement, image of animals and their manipulations, or any other support to all the work stated statistically or in tables, graphs, etc. vi) About the literature, please check to add more recent references up on needs and availability.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guillermo Bracamonte
Department, University & Country	National University of Cordoba, Argentine