



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_24441
Title of the Manuscript:	MOLECULAR INSIGHTS INTO THE ROLE OF INFLAMMATION AND OXIDATIVE STRESS IN EPILEPSY.
Type of the Article	REVIEW 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	In this manuscript the authors discuss inflammation and reactive oxygen species during seizures and epilepsy. Unfortunately the manuscript is not well written enough to convey the authors' argument. The manuscript would benefit from significant linguistic revision given poor grammar and awkward wording throughout which substantially detracts from readability. The manuscript needs better organization. There is not consistent interpretation of the studies reviewed in a manner that supports the authors underlying goal. Is there a particular type of epilepsy that the authors are focusing on or would it be more appropriate to discuss seizures regardless of the etiology? Some of the discussion is too general and should be more detailed with a focus on the significance of the data. One approach that may help focus the manuscript is a clear description of the cellular, molecular and electrophysiology involved in a seizure and in epilepsy. This way the reader can put the discussion of inflammation and ROS in this context.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Revision of the manuscript in ways described above is needed before more specific comments can be made regarding the content.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the Abstract: "innate acquired ability" does not make sense in that "innate" and "acquired" have opposite meanings. Introduction: 1. "active" epilepsy should be defined. 2. In the sentence: "Hence in this review we have tried to focus on possible role of inflammation and oxidative stress in epilepsy and amelioration of which will offer neuroprotection to degenerating neurons, hence serve as novel approach for treatment of epileptic seizure," the goal of the review should be more clearly stated. A more appropriate statement may be: "We will discuss evidence for the role of inflammation and oxidative stress in epileptogenesis. A better understanding of these pathways may inform future treatment options." The current statement is both too tentative and too bold.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Matthew Loftspring
Department, University & Country	Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA