

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	European Journal of Medicinal Plants
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJMP_84885
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Gabanergic and, or serotonergic in the anti-sezure activity of methanol extract of Cranium jagus (J. Thomps) in experimenral mice.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journalejmp.com/index.php/EJMP/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This manuscript describes a series of in vivo tests on the methanol extracts of both the dried bulbs and leaves gathered from the plant <i>Cranium jagus</i>. This plant, which grows in tropical areas of Central Africa, is used in traditional folk medicine for treatment of epilepsy, pain and inflammations. Thus, investigating the pharmacological effects in various animal models is a worthwhile research topic. The authors conclude that the antiseizure activity is likely a result of effects on the GABAergic and, or serotonergic nervous systems.</p> <p>However, their experimental approach has various weaknesses: 1) the investigated extracts are a mixture of many different substances, 2) the animal models are not very specific and thus rather inconclusive concerning mechanisms of action, and lastly 3) the effects of the extracts on the metabolism of the pharmacological test substances are unknown. This is the major weakness of this manuscript because natural products can have profound effects on drug metabolism, in particular by inhibiting drug metabolizing enzymes such as cytochrome P450. This could lead to an increase in potency of the test drugs, e.g. hexobarbitone, diazepam, flumazenil, cyproheptadine, leading to false conclusions that the extracts exerted a pharmacological effect while all they did was interfere in metabolism of the test drugs. The authors need to study the effects of their methanol extracts on the stability of the test drugs in mouse hepatic S9 fractions (either by HPLC or TLC) to rule out any inhibition of drug metabolizing activity by the extracts. At the least, the authors need to discuss in their paper these pit-falls to their experimental design so the reader is aware of alternative explanations.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>What grade methanol was used? Was it distilled prior to use?</p> <p>Many misspellings in the manuscript; e.g., antiseizure and experimental are misspelled in the title.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Patrick Bednarski
Department, University & Country	University of Greifswald, Germany