

Review Form 1.8

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORRIN_120169
Title of the Manuscript:	Phenobarbitone Toxicity: Management of acute and chronic Overdose
Type of the Article	Case report

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.journalajorin.com/index.php/AJORRIN/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.8

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	YES It is important for the scientific community as it defines the barbiturate toxicity understanding.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES, The title is suitable for this article	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	YES, The abstract of the article is comprehensive in nature	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES,	
Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <i>(Please write few sentences regarding this manuscript to justify your answer)</i>	YES, The manuscript is scientifically correct as the mechanism of action and toxicity of phenobarbitone potentiating the GABA is accurate, as well as the treatment approaches for the toxicity are well founded.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The references included in the manuscript are good but but incorporating more recent and comprehensive sources will enhance the relevance of the study.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the article is generally suitable, but there are areas where clarity, grammar, and style can be improved	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Deepak K. Bharati
Department, University & Country	St. John Institute of Pharmacy and Research, India