

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_INDJ_123394</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Crude Extracts of Bryophyllum pinnatum Mitigate Ketamine-Induced Neurotoxicity by Modulating NMDA Receptors in Wistar Rats</b>
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript is exceptionally well-written and offers a significant contribution to the field.</li> <li>2. The manuscript presents original research that addresses an important gap.</li> <li>3. The clarity and coherence of the arguments presented make it valuable resource for researchers.</li> <li>4. The manuscript effectively bridges theoretical and practical aspects of the topic.</li> </ol>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract of the article is comprehensive and presents a picture of manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript is organized in a logical and accessible manner.</li> <li>2. The flow of information is smooth and the structure supports a clear understanding of research.</li> <li>3. The figures and tables are well designed and effectively illustrate the research.</li> </ol>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The research is thorough and meticulously conducted.</li> <li>2. The novel approach and innovative findings provide fresh perspectives and advance our understanding of the topic.</li> <li>3. The robustness of the analysis adds considerable value to the findings.</li> </ol>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The citations are relevant and enhance the manuscript's credibility and depth.	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The writing is clear, concise and engaging. Technical terms are well defined, and complex ideas are communicated effectively.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is pleasure to read and understand.	

#### 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>	

### Review Form 3

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Esha Yadav</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Brahmanand P.G. College, India</b>