

Review Form3

Book Name:	Pharmaceutical Science: New Insights and Developments
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_4118
Title of the Manuscript:	Anticonvulsant Profile of the Enantiomers of DL- HEPP
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is significant as it addresses the urgent need for improved treatments for refractory epilepsy. This condition affects 1% of the global population and remains poorly managed in a substantial portion of patients. By investigating the anticonvulsant activity and neurotoxicity of DL-HEPP and its enantiomers, the study offers valuable insights into the potential of these compounds as candidates for epilepsy treatment. The comparison of DL-HEPP with sodium valproate demonstrates its potential efficacy in seizure models, highlighting its promising anticonvulsant properties. The study also explores the role of the GABAergic system in the anticonvulsant activity of these compounds, which could lead to novel therapeutic strategies. Overall, this research contributes to the development of better treatments for epilepsy, a condition with significant unmet medical needs.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a solid overview of the study, detailing the aims, methodology, results, and conclusions. However, it could be enhanced by more concise language and better clarity in some sections. It effectively conveys the importance of investigating DL-HEPP and its enantiomers as potential anticonvulsant agents for refractory epilepsy, emphasizes the experimental approach, and reports significant findings. To improve it further, the conclusion could be more explicit regarding the broader implications of the results and the need for future research. Additionally, key results like the performance of DL-HEPP compared to sodium valproate could be emphasized earlier.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but are not recent. Only one article from the years 2020 to 2025 is cited in the manuscript, and less than 3 article from the years 2015 to 2019	

Review Form3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Acceptable Language Quality for scholarly communications	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ruby Varghese
Department, University & Country	School of Sciences, Jain Deemed To Be University, India