

Review of: "An Investigation of The Phytochemical Richness of Fresh *Musa Paradisiaca* L. (Plantain) Stem Juice and Its Anticonvulsant Potential on Pentylene-tetrazole (Ptz)-Challenged Rats"

Ana Margarida Borges¹

¹ Instituto Politécnico de Bragança

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall: The article is interesting, good, and well-organized. However, there are some things to point out. For this reason, I recommend the publication of this article after its correction.

1. **Title:** It's good, and it goes according to your investigation. However, the species of the plant should be *italics*.
2. **English grammar, sentence structure, and article design:** The article is written in simple and understandable English, without major errors. However, there are some connections between ideas that do not make sense.
3. **Abstract:** Good abstract. Everything is connected, and the English is good. However, It's missing a context of the investigation at the beginning, and the part of the conclusion should be reviewed. Moreover, in the first line, you made a mistake: "fresh *Musa paradisiaca*".
4. **Background:** Solid information on the background of your study. However, and this is a major point, it's missing the connection of the ideas. Sometimes it feels that the information comes out of nowhere. Review this in a way that the reader has a common thread. Furthermore, before the last line, you made a mistake: "how the *Musa paradisiaca* stem".
5. **Materials and Methods:** Very good, it contains all the information required. Nothing major to point out. However, in *experimental design*, on the first line, review the references "to Gupta et al. (1999)"; also *inexperimental design*, on the second line, you should put the numbers the same way, with space or without space.
6. **Results:** One of the best parts of the article. It's well explained, it has everything needed, it has good tables to follow up the information, it's very well organized, and with good results. I should point out that I liked the division by episodes. However, when you finish which episode, you put in little points for the different groups – You should give some context before to make it more complete.
7. **Discussion:** Another really good part. Again, it's well explained, it has everything needed, it's very well organized, and with good discussion between the study itself and others. I should point out, again, that I liked the division by episodes. However, in the first line, correct: "MP stem juice were"; before the last line of the first paragraph, you use "However" to try to connect the ideas, but you are adding to the idea and not going against it – So I recommend "Moreover," for example; in the first line of the second paragraph, correct: "stem juice as no"; in the fifth line of the second paragraph, correct: "and effect of *Musa*" (space added for clarity).

8. Conclusion: Good, but short - With such good results, you should describe them more in the form of a conclusion. Moreover, in the second line of the paragraph, you use “However” to try to connect the ideas, but you are adding to the idea and not going against it – So I recommend “Moreover,” for example.
9. References: You should review this part; you use old references (more than 10 years old) - Example: *Beck H, Elger, CE (2008) Epilepsy Research: A Window onto Function to and Dysfunction of the Human Brain. Dialogues in Clin Neurosci 10(1): 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.31887/DCNS.2008.10.1/hbeck>.*