

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_127414
Title of the Manuscript:	WITHDRAWAL EFFECTS ON ANTIOXIDATIVE AND NEUROHISTOCHEMICAL DEFICITS IN ACETAMINOPHEN INDUCED TOXICITY IN CEREBELLAR CORTEX OF ADULT WISTAR RATS
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	It is a very basic study focusing on the withdrawal symptoms. Only one region of the brain was targeted and limited assays were performed.	
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.	A lot of focus on methodology, very little on results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Justification regarding the selection of biochemical assays and a clear sample number for each assay needs to be stated. How was the dosage selected? The study is very basic.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript currently looks like a very first, unchecked draft. Grammatical errors need to be rechecked. Writing style is not scientific. Abbreviations are not used properly.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In vitro should be italicized. 2. Sentences like 'According to [22], excitatory inputs are generated by ...' are very frequent and make no sense. References should be used properly. 3. References are cited in the middle of the sentences (e.g. reference 38 - 40). 4. Research gap, question and aims are missing in the introduction. 5. Writing errors are very frequent e.g. Thirty 30 healthy adult wistar rats, All the animals were randomly divided into three (3) groups n=10. 6. The quality of figures is very bad. 7. Acetaminophen (Apap) abbreviation has been defined repeatedly. It should be defined upon first use and then used consistently. 8. Symbols used in the figures are not appropriately defined in the legends. 9. Magnification. 100 and 400??? 10. No result description for histology images? 11. Plate numbers defined instead figure numbers are mentioned in the histology results. 12. Plate 5 images have a bad quality. 13. Mention n number under each image so that we can evaluate the outcomes based on the number of animals. 14. Scale bars are missing in histology. 15. Why wasn't a quantitative analysis performed on histology results? 16. Why was the study performed on cerebellum only? Why not use other brain regions? 17. Introduction should be more comprehensive. It contains unnecessary sections. 18. Why did the authors select LDH, SOD and CAT? 19. Most of the discussion section is just the repetition of results. It should focus on their interpretation in the light of previous studies. 20. How was the dosage selected? Is it comparable to the dosage used in humans? 	

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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Aneeqa Noor</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>National University of Sciences and Technology, Pakistan</p>