



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_42430
Title of the Manuscript:	Mechanism of Anticonvulsant Effects of Ethanol Leaf Extract and Fractions of Milicia Excelsa (Moraceae) in Mice.
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Results indicated in the table should conform to results stated in text. In text results indicates p-values whereas results in the tables indicate Mean±SEM.</p> <p>All results should indicate the exact P-value as found on statistical test other than e.g result was significant at p&lt;0.05 which is not specific.</p> <p>I have indicated minor revision but the concern MUST be addressed as I expect the authors to be having the results and would do a quick correction.</p>	<p>Conscientious efforts have been made to indicate the specific F-value together with the p-value in the text e.g. [<math>F_{(4, 25)} = 24.513</math>, <math>p &lt; 0.0001</math>] and where p value was specific as contained in the statistical test e.g [<math>F_{(4, 25)} = 4.389</math> ; <math>p = 0.008</math>]. However, in the table, values were expressed as Mean± SEM and level of significance indicated as <math>p &lt; 0.05</math> because it will be monotonous to repeat the F-value together with the specific p-value in the legend as indicated in the text. The respective corrections are highlighted under results.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The paper is well written, except the issues stated above which needs to be addressed.</p> <p>The dose of PTZ used was very high and so may not have conformed well to the principle of "Refinement" of procedure</p>	