

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_121136
Title of the Manuscript:	Bryophylum pinnatum extract modulates BDNF expression: The potential implications for oxidative stress regulation and cognitive functions in pain-induced Wistar rats
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community because it addresses a critical area of research involving the management of chronic pain and oxidative stress, which are both major contributors to cognitive decline. The study's comprehensive approach, which includes pharmacological evaluation, neurobehavioral assessments, and biochemical analyses, provides valuable insights into the potential therapeutic effects of Bryophyllum pinnatum extract and morphine.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of your article is quite descriptive but could benefit from a few adjustments to enhance clarity and conciseness. Here's a revised version: Revised Title: "Modulation of BDNF Expression by Bryophyllum pinnatum Extract: Implications for Oxidative Stress and Cognitive Function in Pain-Induced Wistar Rats"	
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 of your article provides a good overview but could benefit from some refinement to enhance clarity and comprehensiveness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure and subsections of a manuscript are crucial for presenting research in a clear and logical manner.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The scientific robustness and technical soundness of this manuscript are evident through its rigorous experimental design and comprehensive methodology. The study employs a well-structured approach with detailed descriptions of the procedures, ensuring reproducibility and reliability of results. The data analysis is methodologically sound, utilizing appropriate statistical techniques to validate the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and include foundational and relevant studies	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments	NIL	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M Sivakumar
Department, University & Country	Sree Balaji Medical College and Hospital, India