

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

Manal Hamed¹

¹ National Research Center, Egypt

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Editor

According to the manuscript entitled "Neurotherapeutic Comparison of Aripiprazole and Ethanolic Extract of *Fragaria Ananassa* on Cerebrum and Amygdala of Methamphetamine Intoxicated Male Wistar Rats"

There are numerous fatal scientific mistakes, therefore I advise against publication in your valued journal.

Some of the mistakes are mentioned as follows:

1. The authors measured the biochemical parameters in the serum. So, why they mentioned cerebrum and amygdala in the title, especially no histopathological analysis was done in those regions.
2. This article is written by one Chioma Odi or two authors (Odi, C.F and Ezejindu, D.N).
3. The abstract must be rewritten. See the corrections in the attached file.
4. The keywords need to be corrected as in the attached file.
5. Some corrections are needed in the introduction as in the attached file.
6. In material and methods section, the ethical approval number must be added.
7. Which part of the plant is used in this study?
8. Put the extraction method of the plant.
9. The authors must do at least the phytochemical analysis of the plant used.
10. Mention the acclimatization condition, the animal's weight, and sex.
11. Missed references for the behavioral test used.
- 12-The methods of oxidative stress markers are missed and their references. Oxidative stress is not enough to examine the toxicity in this study. Inflammatory mediators, neurotransmitters, brain histopathology, and many other tests must be done.
- 13-How ANOVA run with student-t- test. ANOVA compares means of different groups, while student-t-test is run to compare two groups only. ANOVA run with post-hoc test of any other test.

14- Unexpected results. How the antioxidants parameters are not affected. It is meaning that the induced agent is not toxic, while all the previous literatures mentioned its toxicity as well as the title and aim of the article.

Table legends are missed.

15- In table 2, the units of MDA, SOD and CAT are missed.

16- In table 3, it displayed the mirror water maize. Where the other behavioral tests that mentioned in the method section.

17- Poor discussion without any references.

18- Poor conclusion. No reference used in the conclusion. You must prove the effect of the plant used by your own results not by previous references. This is explain why you must do a phytochemical analysis of the plant.

19- The references are not up-to dated and there are some missing references as WHO, 2023, etc.

Regards