



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRMPS_45797
Title of the Manuscript:	LONG-TERM CONSUMPTION OF KOLA-NUT (COLA NITIDA) DIET DECREASED ANXIETY RELATED BEHAVIOUR IN MICE.
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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>)



SDI 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 study is premature for publication in AJRIMPS in present form. It is concern that only two experimental groups were included in this study, when studies are design to identify the effects on anxiety-like behaviour of some substances at preclinical research it is recommended that at less three different doses/concentration/proportions are evaluated. Including only a “doses” it is a limited study with low impact in the field. Also it is necessary that in the experimental design the authors include a pharmacological reference of the substance evaluated in this case an anxiolytic or anxiogenic drug. Some recommendations are suggested to improve present report. They are presented in order of apparition in the text:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Title and text. The botanic name of plants requires a special kind of writing. The genus start with capital letter and specie start with lowercase letter, and both require writing in <i>italics</i>, follow of the authors. Example: <i>Cola nitida</i> Schott & Endl. 2) Keywords are insufficient, please include at less two more. 3) Introduction section fails to support the potential effect of this kolanut on anxiety. There are not sufficient data that support this possibility. Please include it. 4) In methods it is necessary to include the national and international ethics guidelines in which present study was based. 5) What was the rationale for use 50% w/w of the diet, and a 28-day treatment, please support this rationale. 6) The authors never describe the evaluated variables in OPT, EPM, and LDT. This information requires be included in method section and operationally describe it. 7) Really the open field is a “maze” generally the open field is a cage. 8) Results are duplicated. They are described in text (with numerical values) and also represented in figures. Please only select one form to give results. 9) Discussion fail to really “discusses” the own results, actually is only a repeat of results. For example, what is the interpretation of each variable in each test? What happen whit these variables with anxiolytic or anxiogenic drugs? What is the interpretation of importance of the correlation founded in present study? All this requires be discussed and contrasted with previously published data. 10) The authors sated that not significant changes in “locomotor activity” was founded in the animals, therefore they interpreted that the effect detected in EPM is an anxiolytic-like effect. This is incorrect, when we use EPM and DLT it is necessary to measure the horizontal displacement as a measure of spontaneous locomotor activity. Without information the displayed behaviour in EPM and LDT may be erroneously interpreted. Rearing and the other evaluated behaviour are not a measured of locomotor activity, they reflect only a exploration activity. In this way, how the authors support that caffeine (a CNS stimulant) contained in kolanuts produces antianxiety effects? This topic requires further analysis and discussion. The used references to discusses effects of caffeine are 40 years old. Please include actual references; there are many differences in the interpretation between old and new published works. 11) All manuscript has multiple grammar, syntactic and typo errors. It is necessary to review carefully all manuscript. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This was mostly a typographic error. I have effected the necessary corrections 2. Key words have been increased 3. Some references have been indicated to support this 4. I have included a the protocol number obtained when approval was given by the faculty animal ethics committee. 5. A similar studies which have been appropriately referenced used the same design. This was to mimic the effect of long term consumption of kola nut. 6. We thought to avoid repetitions. So, we described the variables while reporting the results. 7. The open field apparatus. Change has been effected 8. There are no results duplications. Stating numerical values in the text preceding figures is normal mode of result presentation not a duplication. Notice that the text for preceding the tables do not have the same presentation. 9. Interpretation of results have been included in the discussions 10. Well locomotor activity was not significant so to save space, I did not include it for the open field. However that for light/dark box was indicated, still no significant results. 11. Our apologies for the typographic errors in the manuscript. We have gone through the manuscript and effected corrections.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Unfortunately, present version of the manuscript is a premature report that is not recommended to be considered for possible publication in your Journal. Some comments are sent to authors to improve the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	It is necessary to write in the same format and correctly the references, present version has a lot of error.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Yes. The authors never stated the ethics guidelines in which based this investigation. It is necessary to support the ethics in the use and care of animals included in the investigation.</p>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>