

ReviewForm1.6

Journal Name:	InternationalNeuropsychiatricDiseaseJournal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_89903
Title of the Manuscript:	NEUROLOGICAL AND MOLECULAR INTERACTIONS OF PHYTOCONSTITUENTS FROM RICINUS COMMUNIS ROOT EXTRACT- A PHARMACOLOGICAL AND COMPUTATIONAL APPROACH
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.journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/editorial-policy>)

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>The chosen field is interesting as there is a constant concern to identify natural compounds with beneficial pharmacological effects. Ricinus communis root extract has been studied in detail for its antioxidant, anxiolytic, anti-inflammatory effects through recent studies.</p> <p>The method used is established in experimental studies, respecting scientific rigors, with 4 analyzed study groups. Easily reproducible experiments, with pertinent conclusions and pharmacological extrapolations, which constitute the premises of more in-depth studies.</p> <p>The conclusions are pertinent, the study opening the opportunity for future phyto-pharmacological research.</p> <p>The whole article respects the scientific conditions, it is written in a clear and concise way and with a bibliography focused on the topic, which could have been more generous.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	More bibliographic indexes	
Optional/General comments	<p>The English used is correct, abbreviations are explained on first use in the text, keywords are chosen correctly.</p> <p>The bibliography is correctly written, but more bibliographic indexes are recommended.</p> <p>Minor revision, because in its current form I give a grade (>8-9)</p>	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cirimbei Ciprian
Department, University & Country	Bucharest Institute of Oncology, Romania