

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_117279
Title of the Manuscript:	Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of Phenibut: Their Potential Dependence on Endogenous Hydrogen Sulfide : A Literature Review
Type of the Article	Review 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>	<p>1. The manuscript is important due to the continuous need for more effective drugs with less side effects especial in the neural field with the rising percentage of depression patients as well as neurodegenerative diseases such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's. Review articles in particular offer a quick and informative overview on the topic discussed.</p> <p>2. The title suggests a dependence of phenibut on endogenous hrdrogen sulfide but upon reading the article, I could not find studies discussing this relationship. Phenibut Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics and Hydrogen sulfide properties were discussed separately, then a study linking them was suggested, so in my opinion the title can be (Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of Phenibut: A Literature Review). The part for Hydrogen Sulfide can be used in a separate review or paper.</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive and well structured.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate .</p> <p>5. The review is prepared in a scientifically correct way.</p> <p>6. About 5 or six references are from the past 3 years the rest are older, but the author states in the methodology that they searched for the most recent papers about this topic, so maybe there aren't many recent papers.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes the English quality is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There is an ambiguity about the interaction of Phenibut with GABA receptors: In the introduction it was stated that phenibut does not interact directly with GABA receptors, but then in Pharmacodynamics of phenibut section: fifth paragraph;first line, it was stated that phenibut binds directly to the GABA B receptor. Please add further explanation to this point.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Radwa Shokry Megahed
Department, University & Country	Ain Shams University, Egypt