

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_103617
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Antioxidant Activity of Withania Somnifera in Equine
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://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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes The manuscript could be important for the scientific community depending on several factors, including the novelty and significance of the research findings, the relevance of the study to the field of equine health and medicine, and the quality of the research methodology and analysis.</p> <p>2. The title clearly indicates that the study focuses on evaluating the antioxidant activity of Withania somnifera (Ashwagandha) in horses (equine).</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article provides a brief overview of the study's main elements, but it could benefit from some improvements to make it more comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Overall, the manuscript follows a logical structure with appropriate subsections for an academic research article, including introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and conclusion.</p> <p>5. Very good, The results and discussion section presents the data collected on different sampling days and discusses the findings in relation to previous studies. It acknowledges that there were non-significant increases in enzymatic and non-enzymatic antioxidants after the administration of Withania somnifera, and the discussion provides context for these results.</p> <p>6. Good, but add more reference update 2019 - 2023</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General 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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Theeranat Suwanaruang
Department, University & Country	Kalasin University, Thailand