

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_95600
Title of the Manuscript:	Short-term Effects of Garlic-based diets on mRNA Expression of Angiotensinogen, Angiotensin-1 Converting Enzyme, and Atrial Natriuretic Peptide in Cyclosporine-induced Prehypertensive Rats
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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)

## Review Form 1.7

<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The article deals with an extremely relevant topic for the scientific community and public health. The focus of the study on hypertension, particularly considering garlic as an effective method for controlling blood pressure, makes this article even more interesting because it is an easily accessible substance that is commonly used in cooking and diets around the world.</p> <p>The title of the article clearly expresses and covers the entire content of the study. The abstract, likewise, is written in an extremely synthesized way, appropriately highlighting the article content in just a few sentences.</p> <p>The article is divided into sections and is structured appropriately, in accordance with the standards used in original article scientific publications. Additionally, the scientific references used seem adequate and sufficient to support the information presented in the study.</p> <p>Please organize the figures appropriately. Currently, the first figure is listed as 'A' and 'B', then the next figure is 'figure 1'. Suggestion: Figure 1A and 1B, then Figure 2.</p> <p>In figure B, the statistic data and significance appears to be incomplete. Currently, the asterisks are listed below/off the figure. Additionally, there are 12 asterisks while there are 7 grouped data bars. It is not clear what the asterisks are comparing or signifying. What is the 'p value' for this data? Please restructure/redistribute the symbols of significance and clearly describe what is being compared in the figure legend.</p> <p>In the final part of the introduction, the authors state ... "this research examined these effects." Please write clearly what 'these effects' are here. In its current form, the sentence is incomplete and potentially confusing.</p> <p>Please consider rephrasing the abstract, where the authors state... "Increased Na<sup>+</sup> and K<sup>+</sup> levels...". The word 'Increased' may not be appropriate as Na<sup>+</sup> and K<sup>+</sup> levels do not both go up at the same time. One increases while the other decreases. Suggestion: "Alteration" or "Variations" could be used to more appropriately describe the observed results.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ana Quenia Gomes da Silva Allahdadi</p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p>Federal University of Bahia, Brazil</p>