



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_42362
Title of the Manuscript:	Behavioural Reactions of Random-Bred Mice under the Influence of Hypouricemia and Aegopodium podagraria L. Preparations
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1.Look at the guidance author of this journal.</p> <p>2.Repair the paragraphs related to your variables dependent and independent in this study.</p> <p>3.Use the main tables that really valuable in this study and or the valuable sentences related to your results study.</p> <p>4.Choose the right statements/sentences in each paragraph.</p>	<p>Dear Reviewer,</p> <p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>We have considered your comments and made changes to the revised manuscript, together with the changes that arose from the comments of the other reviewers (highlighted in yellow colour). We have provided the complete answers to the comments in the pdf file, point by point (please find below).</p> <p>1. Several corrections were made within the manuscript. The standard paper template was used.</p> <p>2.Our study uses the design that is typical for pharmacological research (descriptive study) and the only independent variable is group affiliation. The values measured being the potentially dependent variables are described throughout the text. In safety pharmacology the absence of changes is generally considered to be an informative result.</p> <p>3-4. Using the approaches corresponding to the exploratory study typical for pharmacological research (rather than the confirmatory study in clinics) presupposes the discussion of the obtained results as well as their comparison with the data available in the literature. We made efforts to clarify the results and to edit the Results and Discussion section as well as Conclusions. The text was structured and certain sentences were rewritten. Statistical significance of the differences is reported.</p> <p>Nevertheless, any reader is able to make own decision regarding the subjective definitions such as "valuable" or "right", while we report the obtained results using the generally accepted pharmacological methods.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Recheck it well the abstract and references.</p> <p>Add acknowledgements.</p>	<p>Conclusions were added to the abstract, and several technical errors were corrected in the references list.</p> <p>Acknowledgements section is generally regarded as optional and is added in cases of certain commitments of the authors.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Messy paragraphs and writing, so please remember :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Every manuscript has paragraphs. Each paragraph has the main thought/main idea related to other paragraphs in a paper, so choose the explanatory sentences according to the subject line to be phrases so as to embody the main thought of the paragraph. 2. In 1 paragraph, don't too much explanation that have no relationship between dependent and independent variable related to that paragraph in this manuscript. 3. You have to write related to the theme that you want to discuss in this manuscript. 	<p>This sections deals with the same problem as the points 2, 3, 4 of the second line of the table (Compulsory REVISION comments). Our answers above (points 2-4) can be applied.</p> <p>The answers to the comments in the pdf file concerning the certain sentences and sections are given below.</p>
		<p>The answers to the comments in the pdf file</p> <p>Line 3. The title represents one sentence.</p> <p>Line 5. Latin name was used within the whole manuscript and it was written in italics. The common name was mentioned in the description of the plant. GW abbreviation was removed.</p> <p>Line 10, Line 11. Conclusions were added to the abstract. The structure of the abstract after this addition is in accordance with the scheme present in the paper template and the author's guidance.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>Line 10 concerning doses. The doses substantiation is given in the Materials and Methods section. Since allopurinol as well as Aegopodium podagraria L. preparations possess a dose-dependent action (and two doses of allopurinol were used in the study), the doses are fundamentally important in the abstract.</p> <p>Lines 18–19. The sentence was edited.</p> <p>Lines 64–68. The paragraph was edited. The data concerning the extract and the tincture preparation were separated. They describe the whole process of the preparations obtaining.</p> <p>Line 83. The section was edited. The table with the study design was added. Other information is given within the section in a generally accepted manner.</p> <p>Line 89. The characteristics of water and food was added as well as the reference for the standard operating procedures.</p> <p>Line 90. Conducting the exploratory study at the preclinical level rather than descriptive study in clinics leads to an ambiguity in the mathematical substantiation of the sample size. We aimed to confirm the safety of the studied combination using the numerous psychopharmacological tests, the data obtained in the most of them are not normally distributed. Under such conditions using of the one criterion for such calculation is not rational. Besides, the degree of changes could hardly be forecasted based on our previous data obtained with the other drugs regimens (and the data in the literature concerning psychopharmacological studies in allopurinol-treated animals are scarce). That is why it is not expedient to add these aspects to the manuscript (despite the approximate calculation based on standard deviations and expected changes in immobility time and uricemia give the results of $n > 6.4$). The higher number of the intact mice resulted from the more expressed fluctuations of immobility time (which was one of the most important criteria since it correlated with uricemia) in our previous study which was cited in the manuscript.</p> <p>Line 93. The doses substantiation with the corresponding references is given within the text below the table 1. The text was edited.</p> <p>Line 115. The exact time of preparations administration was added below the table 1.</p> <p>Line 116. The paragraph was edited.</p> <p>Line 127. The sub-subheadings are made in accordance with the paper template of the journal.</p> <p>Line 162. Barbiturate-induced anaesthesia is the generally accepted method allowing to collect the samples in accordance with bioethics requirements, the obtained samples are suitable for purine metabolism studies.</p> <p>Lines 165–166. One of the aims of the current work was directed to the determination of the purine metabolism values, among them the most important are blood uric acid level and xanthine oxidase activity in the liver and kidney. Generally accepted methods were used for these measurements and the corresponding references are given within the text.</p> <p>Line 168. The explanation was added in Materials and Methods as well as in Introduction section.</p> <p>Line 175. The paragraph was edited.</p> <p>Line 186. The table was added to the Materials and Methods section and repeating these data would not increase the informative value of the text. Nevertheless, the information about the absence of the differences in body weight dynamics between groups was added.</p>
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>Lines 186, 225, 256, 300, 310, 389. In the Conclusions section the general summary of the results and their significance for science was added, and the data, which were previously given on page 13, were removed to the Results and Discussion section. Editing was done throughout whole text.</p> <p>Lines 248–249. The table represents data concerning biochemical values and correlations between them. That is why its separation would not improve the data visibility.</p> <p>Line 404. The title of the figure elucidates the method which was applied, the value which was measured and the units used, as well as the experimental interventions. Statistical values are described in the Notes. The discussion of the results is given within the text.</p> <p>Line 436. The sentence was edited.</p> <p>Line 440. In the Conclusions section the general summary of the results and their significance for science was added, and the data, which were previously given on page 13, were removed to the Results and Discussion section. Acknowledgements section is generally regarded as optional and is added in cases of certain commitments of the authors by their decision.</p> <p>Line 469. Ethical Approval section corresponds to the requirements in the present in the paper template and the author's guidance.</p> <p>Line 470. The general style of citing corresponds to the requirements in the present in the paper template and the author's guidance. Nevertheless, several technical errors were corrected (references 9–12, 14, 19, 25, 30, 33).</p> <p>Several technical errors and misprints were also corrected.</p>
--	--	--