

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>Plant name is written wrong "Cranium jagus" in abstract it should be "<i>Crinium jagus</i>"</p> <p>Expand the nonstandard abbreviation.</p> <p>Diazepam (1 mg kg⁻¹) was used as reference anticonvulsant drugs in the experimental models while in results section (graph caption) and also in discussion it is written as 5 mg kg⁻¹.</p> <p>In abstract, conclusion part author did not mention methanol extract of leaf showing activity. He mentioned only methanol extract.</p> <p>In introduction section Crinum jagus (Thomps.) Dandy, it should be Crinum jagus (J. Thomps.) Dandy</p> <p>Author mention in introduction part, chemical investigations of the plant revealed the presence of phenolic compounds in large quantity, which include, tetrahydro-1, 4-oxazine (morpholine), crinamine, lycorine, psuedolycorine, hamayne, bowdensine, and demethoxy-bowdensine, 6-hydroxycrinamine. Although most of them either alkaloid or phenolic alkaloids it should be corrected.</p> <p>In materials and methods section authors should provide institutional ethical committee approval number.</p> <p>The spelling of plant is incorrect most of the places throughout the manuscript, it should be corrected and uniform.</p> <p>First part of discussion is based on extraction techniques which is not important to be written in the discussion and somehow it is the repetition of introduction part. Another part of the discussion is mainly focused to providing background information, authors did not interpret or describe the significance of their findings concerning what was previously reported about the research problem being explored. The discussion should state the study findings considering the published literature and establish inferences from the data. Here author must be discussing limitations of the study and possible opportunities.</p> <p>The current form of the paper is not suitable. Throughout the manuscript sentences are not well constructed, manuscript should be re-write completely and checked by some good English-speaking native. Manuscript can be accepted after addressing all the comments satisfactorily.</p> <p>In my opinion major revision is required.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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:	Sarfaraz Ahmed
Department, University & Country	King Saud University, Saudi Arabia