



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRIMPS_45797</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>LONG-TERM CONSUMPTION OF KOLA-NUT (COLA NITIDA) DIET DECREASED ANXIETY RELATED BEHAVIOUR IN MICE.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research paper</b>

**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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript looks good altogether but suffers from several shortcomings which are as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The scientific name of the plant should be written properly according to the binomial nomenclature. It should be '<i>Cola nitida</i>' and not 'cola nitida'. This mistake should be checked throughout the manuscript.</li> <li>2. The grammar is one of the poor aspects of this manuscript right from the beginning and throughout the manuscript. Authors should consult a native English speaker to proofread the manuscript for language and grammar.</li> <li>3. The permission to carry out animal experimentation has not been obtained from any competent authority. If yes, authors need to mention the protocol approval number from the Institutional Animal Ethics committee of their university.</li> <li>4. Literature survey looks poor. Many papers which should have been a part of this paper are missing. The work done on anxiety and memory needs to be cited and authors can gain a lot as far as this manuscript and the line of work is concerned. It is advised to the authors to include the following references in the manuscript. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phytother Res. 2010 Apr;24(4):486-93. doi: 10.1002/ptr.2932.</li> <li>• Nat Prod Res. 2008;22(16):1472-82. doi: 10.1080/14786410802214199.</li> <li>• <a href="https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13880200902822596">https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13880200902822596</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/jcim.2010.7.1/jcim.2010.7.1.1263/jcim.2010.7.1.1263.xml">https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/jcim.2010.7.1/jcim.2010.7.1.1263/jcim.2010.7.1.1263.xml</a></li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Authors are suggested to correct the manuscript on the basis of above mentioned suggestions and revise it accordingly.</p>	<p>Corrected</p> <p>We have gone through the paper again through and through and have made some corrections to the grammar.</p> <p>Protocol number has been included.</p> <p>I do not think this is very necessary. I have cited some basic research on anxiety and that should suffice.</p> <p>I don't see the reference given here as related to this study. I have added some relevant literature</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments		
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	