



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>)

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	The work is fine, but there are three aspects that deserve a comment: 1) The ABSTRACT must have an item of conclusions and this work does not have it. 2) that signifies the sign & in figure 2. 3) it is not clear to me 'because I do not read it in the conclusions, which brings this study to science	<p>We would like to thank sincerely for the professional and rapid review of the article. 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).</p> <p>1. Conclusions were added to the abstract, and we believe that it really helped to clarify the ideas of the study.</p> <p>2. The formatting was done in the note under the figure 2. The sign indicates the statistically significant differences with the control group for manipulations and hypouricemia. The sign was not changed because the same indication is done in Tables 1 and 2.</p> <p>3. 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 (in an attempt to clarify the data discussion and in accordance with the comment of the second reviewer).</p> <p>We believe the revised manuscript is indeed more scientifically sound.</p> <p>We look forward to receiving your reply.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		