Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**European Journal of Medicinal Plants**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_EJMP_72428**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Hydroethanolic extract of Adenia lobata (Passifloraceae) relieves painful stimulus and subsequent anxiety-like behavior in Mice: both anti-inflammation and antioxidant approaches**
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy)

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	First of all, no study evaluating the acute toxicity of the hydro-alcoholic extract tested does not appear in the article, even if the author relied on previous studies to choose the effective dose, it is important assess the harmlessness of the extract tested according to one of the OECD reference protocols.	Honestly, any previous paper has been done regarding the acute toxicity. However, some studies have tested anticancer, anti-diabetes, anti-typhoid…. etc of the crude extract of *Adenia lobata.* None of these studies have mentioned acute toxicity. The doses used help us for the effective dose chosen in ours study.
Minor REVISION comments	In addition, the author omitted to mention the references of the following tests: Hot Plate test, Open-field test, Elevated plus maze as well as the test for evaluating the level of nitric oxide.	Yes, I did (Please, see yellow highlight)
Optional/General comments	Finally, the author should carefully reread the article in order to correct any spelling errors in the text.	Yes, I followed carefully this recommendation. I reread with more attention the entire manuscript in order to found utmost any grammatical and spelling errors, even if I don't highlight in yellow.

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	I have completed in material and method part the statement of Helsinki about the care and use of lab animals