



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_38810</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>ANTICONVULSANT POTENTIAL OF DICHLOROMETHANE EXTRACT OF Aspilia africana LEAF IN MICE</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</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>)



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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<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> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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&lt; xx.xx] without this information the results are not valid,</p> <p>5) Result section is not correctly described; only tables and figures are included without a specific description of results.</p> <p>6) The U-shape form of results in the figures were not discussed, it is necessary explain and discuses this effect.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>8) All the text requires to be carefully reviewed, a lot of grammar, typographic, and writing mistakes has been detected.</p> <p>9) References require be carefully revising and correcting, some of them are in different format.</p> <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>	Noted



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&lt; 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 discusses 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>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>It is necessary to review all text it has a lot of grammar, typographic and writing mistakes.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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>