

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_90822
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTI-STRESS AND NOOTROPIC ACTIVITY OF ETHANOLIC EXTRACT OF CORIANDRUM SATIVUM AERIAL PARTS
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.journalapri.com/index.php/APRJ/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	Where mechanism is discussed, the emphasis is very much on oxidative stress. Given our growing understanding of the role of neuroinflammation in the integrated stress response, and the well-characterised anti-inflammatory and neuroprotective activity of many of the phytophenolics, the mechanistic aspect of the discussion should ideally be updated, even if no probes were used. The discussion of Alzheimers is similarly outdated. This is increasingly being considered not s a disease but as an end-stage syndrome (like PD), which may be arrived at from many starting points.	
Minor REVISION comments	The term 'adaptogen' is being replaced by xeno-hormetic, which is a much more productive descriptor. Basal activity test scores – the SEM values are <u>surprisingly</u> small. ? In the abstract, it is stated that the results showed that the antioxidant activity of the extract was responsible for the adapogenic / cognitive affects; but this has not been proven. Many phenolic compounds have antioxidant (and anti-inflammatory) properties, but the glycosidic compounds (which were not characterised) do not necessarily have any antioxidant activity.	
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:	Paul Clayton
Department, University & Country	Oxford Brookes University, United Kingdom