

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

Gbadebo Adeleke<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ladoke Akintola University of Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## REVIEW COMMENTS

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

Suggested Title: A Comparison of the therapeutic effects of Aripiprazole and ethanolic extract of (leaf/ tree bark/ root bark) in Methamphetamine-treated Wistar rats.

### Abstract:

Line 2 – *Fragaria ananassa*, extracted ethanolicly (*Fragaria ananassa* was subjected to ethanolic extraction).

- The current study looked at (the current study examined).

Line 4 – How many rats were divided into 8 groups?

Re-write Abstract to reflect introduction/background, methodology, results and conclusion in a scientific manner.

### Keywords:

Remove Wistar rats, put the name of plant used.

### Introduction:

- Needs to be more organized.
- References to be made uniform, i.e. to use either names of authors or numbers.
- Not written scientifically, e.g. when the author described amygdala, he said, these are parts of your brain –this is not scientific.
- Let the introduction describe the plant (botanical description, geographical distribution, reported pharmacological or medicinal properties); Methamphetamine and Aripiprazole (their class of compound, therapeutic uses, toxicities).

**Materials and Methods:**

- First sentence not necessary
- The extraction should be detail – what method of extraction was used (cold or Soxhlet?)
- In what form was the extract used, and what was the vehicle of dissolving it?

**Experimental animals and design:**

- Total number of rats not stated
- The use of 1,2 3, 4 for groups is wrong, use A, B, C or I, II, III
- Weight range of rats, not stated
- The author wrote, group H **will** be administered, past tenses should be used.
- Route and period of dosing, not stated
- The actual samples (serum or plasma), not mentioned
- The authors mentioned cerebrum and amygdala, but took blood sample. Reconcile.
- Biochemical assays studied, not mentioned

**Results and Discussion:**

- The author referred to what happened in acclimatization; this is not appropriate
- Title of table 1, not appropriate; they wrote test substance, instead of stating the actual compounds, distribution of means
- Tables were just copied from Excel, not appropriate
- Results, not discussed

**Conclusion:**

- Badly written; write to reflect the cogent outcome of the study.
- Reference shown in conclusion. Not appropriate

**References:**

They are too few, since there was no discussion.

- 
-