

Review of: "Neurotherapeutic Comparison of Aripiprazole and Ethanolic Extract of *Fragaria Ananassa* on Cerebrum and Amygdala of Methamphetamine Intoxicated Male Wistar Rats"

Shubham Upadhyay¹

¹ Yenepoya University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Introduction:

1. Such a long introduction for aripiprazole does not seem to be necessary. The broken sentences in the middle for the introduction of aripiprazole can be combined with the earlier paragraph itself. There is no need for such a long introduction for strawberry and the brain regions as well. These long introductions seem to have diluted the “aim” of this study.
2. The introduction does not give any information on why the authors chose *Fragaria ananassa*’s ethanolic extract for the study. Why was this particular plant chosen for the study? The information given in the introduction is extremely generic and holds no significance for the particular study.

In conclusion, the introduction is extremely poorly written. The introduction needs to have the above information and a lot of changes before it is submitted to any journal.

Methodology:

1. There is no explanation about the animal groupings. There needs to be information about why every group was formed, what was the basis for administering methamphetamine or aripiprazole, or both of them together. This information can only be found out after reading the title.
2. There is also no information about the basis for the dosage given to the animals. How were these dosages selected for administration?
3. What is the meaning of 200mg/kg of ethanolic extract? Ethanol will extract thousands of metabolites from the strawberry extract. What does the “200mg” signify? Which metabolite is being measured here and represented as 200 mg?
4. How was the dosage for the strawberry prepared? The protocol for dosage preparation has not been mentioned. What plant part was used for preparing the dosage, the fruit, leaf, or root? How much of the plant part was used, and what was done after ethanol addition? How was ethanol removed? There are so many parts of this sample preparation that are missing from the methodology section.

In conclusion, the methodology part has been written in an extremely casual manner. The methodology section needs to be extremely detailed.

Results:

My comments for the results and the conclusion section of the manuscript remain the same as my previous comments for the introduction and the methodology part. They have to be written in a detailed manner. There is no point in looking at the results part, as there are so many questions about the methodology section. If the methodology is not understood properly, unfortunately, it becomes extremely difficult to interpret/trust the results.

Final comment:

The manuscript needs a lot of revisions before it can be published anywhere. The author needs to read a lot of scientific papers to understand how a proper scientific paper is written. Currently, the manuscript is in no condition to be published.