SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_44924**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comparison of Anxiolytic Effect of Aqueous Extract of Valeriana officinalis Root with Buspirone in Mature Male Mice**
Type of the Article	**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)

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	1. Introduction section needs to rewrite. Many unrelated statement includes in this section. 2. Why the authors choose *Valeriana officinalis* roots? Need to mention in introduction section. 3. Need to includes a table mentioning the group details. 4. How to calculate the frequency? 5. Discussion section is poorly written. Need to modify thoroughly. 6. Additional figure showing the preparation of extract will be more striking than figure 1. Try to consider this issue.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Are there any reasons for mentioning the sub-hypothesis? If no, authors need to delete sub-hypothesis. 2. Materials and methods section require to rearrange. Is the materials are necessary to mention? If no, authors need to delete the list. 3. Dose calculation list need to rearrange. 4. References needs to rearrange according to the journal guidelines.	
Optional/General comments	Overall the manuscript is well-written. But still needs to change many things. Authors should consider the above mentioned major revisions and carefully resolve these issues.	

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

Kindly see the following link:

SDI Review Form 1.6

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

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:	***Talha Bin Emran***
Department, University & Country	***BGC Trust University, Bangladesh***