



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Food Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AFSJ_63867
Title of the Manuscript:	New insight in the Sedative and Anxiolytic Activities of Amaranthus tricolor L. Leaves Extract 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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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	This article follows the publication guidelines proposed by Archives of Current Research International, proposing pre-clinical experimental strategies to investigate sedative and anxiolytic activities of amaranthus tricolor L. leaves extract in mice. Therefore, I recommend the publication and congratulate the discussion of the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Comments have been attached to the manuscript.</p> <p>Line 46-48: If there is no evidence in the literature, what clinical or anecdotal evidence to presuppose any sedative or anxiolytic effect of this herbal medicine? Please make the rationale for this study clearer.</p> <p>Line 63: Please insert the protocol number of the animal ethics committee.</p> <p>Line 69: If possible, insert a figure with the experimental design to detail the sequence of the tests.</p> <p>Line 73: Is there any reference to justify such doses?</p> <p>Line 75-76: How many? Any specific reason for the coloring of the squares?</p> <p>Line 77-78: What is the interval between administration and testing?</p> <p>Line 114-115: Please indicate which normality test is used.</p> <p>Line 118: I believe that a line graph (Mean and SEM) is more representative of an ANOVA test.</p> <p>Line 121: Would it be better to use the term significant?</p> <p>Line: 139: Why not a graphical representation?</p>	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Francisco Bruno Costa
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Ceará, Brazil