



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_38810
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTICONVULSANT POTENTIAL OF DICHLOROMETHANE EXTRACT OF <i>Aspilia africana</i> LEAF IN 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:

(<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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>The proposal could be of interest; however, it is necessary to include relevant information to support present investigation and results. Some recommendations to improve present manuscript are as follow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the authors did not justify the use of the dichloromethane extract, why was it selected to the study? Additionally, the authors stated that dichloromethane is a non-polar extract, so why did the authors use the <i>i.p.</i> administration if it is only used to polar or hydrophilic substances? It is a very important question that the authors require explain. 2) The authors did not indicate what was the vehicle to dissolve the plant extract. It was saline solution used? but if the extract is a non-polar, how was it dissolved in saline? 3) The used dose of diazepam as pharmacological control of anticonvulsant activity is not appropriated, actually 1 mg/kg of diazepam is used as anxiolytic at experimental level, anticonvulsant doses of diazepam are in the range of 5-15 mg/kg in mice. The authors require explaining this discrepancy and support with scientific references. 4) The use of 4 mice per group is a very low number to obtain statistical significant differences; it is necessary to increase the number of subjects in each group. In this way, the authors did not include the F values in description of results [F(xx.xx), xx.xx; p< xx.xx] without this information the results are not valid, 5) Result section is not correctly described; only tables and figures are included without a specific description of results. 6) The U-shape form of results in the figures were not discussed, it is necessary explain and discuss this effect. 7) The evaluation of only one variable to detect a potential anticonvulsant effect in insufficient, at less two phases require to be evaluated: a: latency to onset of myoclonic, clonic, and tonic-clonic seizure; and b: protection against the lethal effect of pentylenetetrazole and strychnine (Mora-Perez and Hernández-Medel, Neurología 2016; 31(3): 161-168, among many others). 8) All the text requires to be carefully reviewed, a lot of grammar, typographic, and writing mistakes has been detected. 9) References require be carefully revising and correcting, some of them are in different format. <p>Present manuscript corresponds to a Research Paper about potential anticonvulsant properties of several doses of a dichloromethane extract from <i>Aspilia africana</i> leaf evaluated in mice. This effect was evaluated in two pharmacological models of convulsions (pentylenetetrazole and strychnine), and electroshock; additionally the effect of treatments on motor coordination was evaluated in Rota-road test. The proposal could be of interest; however, in present form it is a very preliminary study, which devoid of sufficient scientific quality and much important information needs to be included in the manuscript. In general principal problems are as follow: 1) the authors did not justify the use of the dichloromethane extract, why was it selected to the study? Additionally, the authors stated that dichloromethane is a non-polar extract, so why did the authors use the <i>i.p.</i> administration if it is only used to polar or hydrophilic substances? It is a very important question that the authors require explain. 2) The authors did not indicate what was the</p>	<p>Noted</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>vehicle to dissolve the plant extract. It was saline solution used? but if the extract is a non-polar, how was it dissolved in saline?. 3) The used dose of diazepam as pharmacological control of anticonvulsant activity is not appropriated, actually 1 mg/kg of diazepam is used as anxiolytic at experimental level, anticonvulsant doses of diazepam is in the range of 5-15 mg/kg in mice. The authors require explaining this discrepancy. 4) the use of 4 mice per group is a very low number to obtain statistical significant differences, it is necessary to increase the number of subjects in each group. In this way, the authors did not include the F values in description of results [F(xx.xx), xx.xx; p< xx.xx] without this information the results are not valid. Check all the text it has several typographical and grammar mistakes, 5) result section is not correctly described; only tables and figures are included without a specific description of results, 6) the U-shape form of results in the figures are not discussed, it is necessary to explain and discuss this effect, 7) the evaluation of only one variable to detect a potential anticonvulsant effect is insufficient, at least two phases require to be evaluated: a: latency to onset of myoclonic, clonic, and tonic-clonic seizure; and b: protection against the lethal effect of pentylenetetrazole and strychnine (Mora-Perez and Hernández-Medel, Neurología 2016; 31(3): 161-168, among many others). 8) All the text requires to be carefully reviewed, a lot of grammar, typographic, and writing mistakes has been detected. 9) References require be carefully revising and correcting, some of them are in different format.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>It is necessary to review all text it has a lot of grammar, typographic and writing mistakes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>