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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Joseph Oloro*
Department, University & Country	*Department of Pharmacology & Therapeutics, Mbarara University of Science & Technology, Uganda.*