

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_115886
Title of the Manuscript:	Cannabis Sativa Boosts Brain Functions and Ameliorate Anxiety, when used Sensibly and not Abusively
Type of the Article	

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript investigates the effects of <i>Cannabis sativa</i> extract on the cognitive and motor functions of rats. The findings suggest that the extract may improve learning, memory, and reduce anxiety-like behaviour in the animals. This research adds to the understanding of cannabis pharmacology and its potential therapeutic applications, making it relevant and important for the scientific community. 2. Yes, the title is perfectly suitable for the conducted study. 3. The abstract provides a clear overview of the study's purpose, methodology, and key findings. However, it could benefit from specifying the duration of the experimental tests and any potential limitations of the study. Overall, it effectively summarizes the main points of the research. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate, with clear delineation between the introduction, methods, results, and conclusion sections. Each section provides relevant information in a logical sequence, aiding comprehension of the study's objectives, methods, and outcomes. 5. The manuscript appears scientifically sound. The study utilized a controlled experimental design with appropriate sample sizes and statistical analyses. 6. Yes. The reference are recent and sufficient to support the study and its results. Still kindly add references related to same study if possible, till the year 2024. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communication based on the provided manuscript. The writing is clear, concise, and technically accurate, which are essential qualities for effective communication in academic settings. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Kindly check for spelling, grammatical errors as it was seen in few places. Scientific names were found not in italics at few places (to name a few places - below the plant image, in conclusion etc).</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:	Shricharan Senthilkumar
Department, University & Country	India