SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
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 Article:	**Original Research Article**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
"Results are expressed as mean ± S.E.M. The significance of different between groups were analysed using one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), followed by post hoc analysis using the Student- Newman-keuls test. GraphPad InStat® Biostatistics software (GraphPad Software, Inc., La Jolla, USA) was used and the level of significance for all tests was set at *P < 0.05". THIS RESULTS DOES NOT INDICATED THE POST HOC ANALYSIS RESULTS AS CLAIMED. IT ONLY HAS ONE WAY ANOVA RESULTS. WITH A POST HOC ANALYSIS RESULTS, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN EASY FOR THE AUTHORS TO POINT THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AND WITHIN GROUPS. The authors have a result to communicate, but are putting it in a way that is not clear. They should show how VEH compares with all others and how each of the other eg. EME, EAF & AF compares to each other. (a post hoc test should have brought out this clearly). At this time, the confidence interval should also be indicated. The editor should ask for raw results for confirmation. Please, consider the response from other reviewers as well. I hope this not considered being too hard but the need for clarity.	We agree with the evaluator's comment on the need for a better communication of our results. In line with this, and in order for clarity and simplicity, we have decided to express the results as Mean ± S.E.M. The significance of difference between groups were analysed using one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), followed by post hoc analysis using the Dunnett (compare all vs vehicle) while the results of the mechanism of anticonvulsant effects were analysed using one way analysis of variance (ANOVA), followed by the Student- Newman-keuls test post hoc analysis. GraphPad InStat® Biostatistics software (GraphPad Software, Inc., La Jolla, USA) was used and the level of significance for all tests was set at *P < 0.05. These we did in order to avoid a cumbersome scenario of how VEH compares with all others [EME (250), EME (500), EME (1000), EAF (250), EAF (500), EAF (1000), AF (250), AF (500), AF (1000) & DZP] and how each of these eg. EME (250), EME (500), EME (1000), EAF (250), EAF (500), EAF (1000), AF (250), AF (500), AF (1000) & DZP compares to each other since our results could as well be presented with the Dunnett (compare all vs vehicle) post hoc analysis. However, for the results of the mechanism of action, the Student-Newman-keuls test post hoc analysis was used. These are the rationale for our decisions and we are hopeful that the evaluator will condescend with us, since his concern is for us to communicate our results better and improve the quality of our manuscript. The raw data is attached for confirmation.