

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_114845
Title of the Manuscript:	The aqueous extract of <i>Bellucia dichotoma</i> Cong. has a protective effect on mice spleens after envenomation by <i>Bothrops atrox</i>: a stereological study
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the need for alternative therapies for snake envenomation, which is a significant public health concern globally, especially in regions with high snakebite incidence such as the Amazon. Investigating the protective effects of Bellucia dichotoma extract on spleens after envenomation by Bothrops atrox contributes to the growing body of knowledge on natural remedies for snakebites, which could be particularly beneficial in areas with limited access to conventional antipitidic treatments. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? The title "The aqueous extract of Bellucia dichotoma Cong. has a protective effect on mice spleens after envenomation by Bothrops atrox: a stereological study" accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. It mentions the key elements of the study, including the plant extract, the experimental model (mice spleens), the envenomation agent (Bothrops atrox), and the methodology (stereological study). Therefore, the title is suitable. 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, including the background, objectives, methods, key findings, and conclusions. It effectively summarizes the protective effects of Bellucia dichotoma extract on spleens after Bothrops atrox envenomation, highlighting the potential therapeutic benefits of the plant extract in mitigating systemic effects. Overall, the abstract is comprehensive and adequately represents the main aspects of the manuscript. 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The manuscript follows a logical structure with clearly defined subsections such as Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, and Discussion. Each section addresses specific aspects of the study in a systematic manner, making it easy to follow and understand the research methodology, results, and interpretations. The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate for scholarly communication. 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Based on the information provided in the manuscript, the research methodology, results, and interpretations appear scientifically sound. The experimental design, including the use of male Swiss mice, sample sizes, venom and extract preparation, and histological analyses using stereology, follows standard scientific protocols. The statistical analyses and comparisons between experimental groups are appropriately described. However, a detailed review of the raw data and statistical methods would be necessary for a thorough assessment of scientific correctness. Also need to improve the quality of the images provided with manuscript. 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. The references cited in the manuscript cover relevant literature on snake envenomation, medicinal plants, spleen anatomy, and stereology. However, it would be beneficial to include more recent references, especially regarding stereological techniques and recent developments in the field of snakebite treatments. Some additional references that could enhance the manuscript include: 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Williams DJ, Gutiérrez JM, Harrison RA, et al. The Global Snake Bite Initiative: an antidote for snake bite. <i>Lancet</i>. 2010 Jan 23;375(9708):89-91. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61747-9. PMID: 20109871.</p> <p>Laustsen AH, Engmark M, Milbo C, et al. From Fangs to Pharmacology: The Future of Snakebite Envenoming Therapy. <i>Curr Pharm Des</i>. 2016;22(34):5270-5293. doi: 10.2174/1381612822666160905151711. PMID: 27604605.</p> <p>Including these types of references would strengthen the manuscript's background and discussion sections.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written with clear and coherent sentences, which enhances readability and understanding. However, minor proofreading for grammar and punctuation errors may further improve the overall quality of language.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript provides valuable insights into the protective effects of <i>Bellucia dichotoma</i> extract against spleen damage caused by <i>Bothrops atrox</i> venom, highlighting potential alternative treatments for snakebite envenomation. With minor improvements in abstract clarity and addition of recent references, the manuscript can make a significant contribution to the scientific literature in this field.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Niketan Deshmukh
Department, University & Country	L J University, India