



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_27022
Title of the Manuscript:	Anxiolytic effect of aqueous root extract of Citrus aurantium in Wistar albino rats
Type of the 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	The article is interesting to me but it needs re-written to clarify some sections such as Abstract, Materials and methods as well as Results and discussion. Ethical issues: Basis of dose selection is a mandatory issue.	This suggestion has been noted and the necessary additions and/or deletions have been made
Minor REVISION comments	'Citrus aurantium': it's coming several times even within the same section, authors' can write like this <i>C. aurantium</i>. There are too many words needing space between them. L 8: unnecessary. It should found in below. Space between p< and the value should be maintained equally and throughout the text. Abstract needs re-written. L 47: Tijani <i>et al.</i>, 2014). L 50/51/53: <i>C. aurantium</i> & space problems. L 58: (0.9% sodium chloride solution) L 62: Wister albino rats: 100 to 120 g? L 73-77: Can be written in one single sentence. L 83: five kilograms five liters..... Why the authors use different number of animals/ test? In fact sometimes it is not clearly mentioned for example - L 99 (Thirty six rats were divided into six groups, seven pergroup.); L 147: Y-maze task; L 169: as they are used 4/5/6 animals in different test! But why here are only six animals? What is the basis of selection of these doses?	Agreed. The correction has been noted and effected. Yes. This has also been rectified. Agreed. Noted and corrected. Corrected. Corrected. Agreed. Corrected. A typographical error. Noted and corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Authors telling that there is a dose-dependent response, but Figure 2-8, I didn't find that. In fact the highest does (200 mg/kg) produces similar activity that of the saline (control) group. The standard (positive control), diazepam groups' results are also should be comparable with 200 mg/kg group. In all cases there is a great difference between these two groups. Figure 3 and 7 should be re-made. Authors' can transfer some data into table format. Authors' plugged results with discussion but I didn't find matching. Gross discussion has been placed below the results, why not with individual results? As they have already abbreviated the terms EPM and EZM, it's not necessary to elaborate them every times and also the AECA. L 285-88: Lister, 1987; Pellow <i>et al.</i>, 1985; is it a correct order? Authors are encouraged to write in brief about the phytochemical test. How may tests have been performed per secondary metabolite? Discussion should be relevant towards the results found and in a concise manner. Reference formatting needs to be checked out Ref 19: journal name should be non-italic. Also space maintenance is a great deal here.	Yes, this has been noted. The extract only had a dose – dependent effect on hole board parameter. This is presented in the discussion. The correction has been made in the abstract. Noted and effected. Result and discussion have been put together for each test Noted and corrected. Noted and corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		