

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_103604
Title of the Manuscript:	PRECLINICAL RESEARCH TOOL INNOVATION IN RESOURCE-SCARCE SETTING – A CASE STUDY OF A MOUSE ANXIETY MULTI-TEST APPARATUS
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:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community as it gives information about a potential asset to preclinical research in anxiolytic drug discovery. The title is ok The abstract is ok, but correctness of some grammars and punctuations are suggestive to add Subsections are ok, the simple errors in grammar and English need to be corrected Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct The references are ok	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Simple errors need to be checked thoroughly	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abu Md Ashif Ikbal
Department, University & Country	Assam University, India