

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_121371
Title of the Manuscript:	MODULATORY EFFECTS OF MORPHINE AND XYLOPIA AETHIOICA EXTRACT ON KAPPA OPIOID RECEPTORS (KOR), Δ OPIOID RECEPTOR (DOR), PAIN HYPERSENSITIVITY AND MOTOR FUNCTIONS IN WSTAR RATS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This paper is of great significance to the scientific community since it investigates the pain-relieving properties of <i>Xylopiya aethiopica</i>, a plant that has been traditionally used for medicinal purposes, in a thorough and scientific manner. The study offers insights into alternate pain management strategies that potentially alleviate the problems of tolerance and reliance commonly associated with traditional opioids, by comparing their effects with morphine. Examining the intricate molecular interactions between opioid receptors and bioactive chemicals in <i>Xylopiya aethiopica</i> enhances our comprehension of the pharmacological characteristics, hence facilitating the development of innovative therapeutic medicines. This research is significant because it tackles the urgent requirement for safer pain management alternatives in the middle of the opioid prevalence.</p> <p>I like the fact the introduction was well structured, direct, simplified but still maintained the context. The elaborate results proved that the study was extensive.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The title of the article is suitable. However, review the following: ▪ Check the Spelling of Wistar ▪ Replace Δ this with Delta, then subsequently, you can use the symbol subsequently ▪ 	
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured, covering the key aspects of the study ▪ Briefly mention how the molecular docking studies were conducted and specify which opioid receptors were targeted. ▪ Mention how the binding affinities were evaluated. Eg, "<i>The binding affinities were evaluated based on the binding energy scores obtained from the docking simulations.</i>" 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The introduction is comprehensive and provides a clear context for the study. ▪ It connected all the main points, direct and not so ambiguous. ▪ In the last paragraph, it will be worthwhile to include the specific aim of the study. <p>Materials and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Break down the text into distinct sections with subheadings for better structure (e.g., Experimental Animals, Treatment Groups, Behavioral Tests, Chemical Analysis, In Silico Studies, and Statistical Analysis). ▪ Provide precise details where necessary, such as specific names of tests or instruments used. ▪ Add the reference number for the ethical approval. You also need to mention in the method section that the animals were handled using standard procedure. The housing conditions and feeding of the animal model should be mentioned as well. ▪ Provided precise details for instruments and tests. For Example, "Rotarod Test: Instrument: Rotarod apparatus (Model 7650, Ugo Basile, Italy), Agilent 7890A GC system coupled with an Agilent 5975C mass selective detector (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA) ▪ Specific settings for the instruments (e.g., temperatures, flow rates) are provided to ensure reproducibility. <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There should be little explanation for table 1 ▪ Explain figure 1 and state the relevance. If it is not relevant, you might consider removing it. ▪ Try to be consistent with your choice of words. For example, the use of week 1 and week 2 in the tables and phase 1 and phase 2 is confusing. Please consider harmonizing this. ▪ I would rather prefer you use this "*"#" after the Standard deviation and make it superscript. Example "14.72±2.70[*]" ▪ There should be a legend to explain the color codes that represents the binding of undec 10-ynoic acid, undecyl ester to DOR. This is applicable to all other binding diagrams. <p>Discussion</p>	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Try to limit the repetition on the discussion of results which you have started in the result section. Also, try to have a more elaborate discussion by making references to other works agreement or disagreement with your study. Also, state the reasons of such agreement/disagreement. <p>Conclusion State the major findings before resorting to the potentials of XA.</p>	
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 manuscript demonstrates scientific accuracy and integrity throughout. The methodologies (with the exception of few corrections) are sound, and the results are presented with clarity and precision, adhering to established scientific principles. The data analysis is thorough, and the conclusions drawn are well-supported by the evidence provided. Overall, the manuscript reflects a high level of scientific correctness, ensuring its reliability and validity within the field.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the article are both sufficient and recent, providing a robust foundation for the research presented. The selection includes a comprehensive range of current and relevant sources, reflecting the latest advancements and trends in the field.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article's language and English proficiency are well-suited for scholarly communication. The book exhibits a distinctive quality of using unambiguous and accurate language, guaranteeing the successful communication of intricate ideas and procedures. The article demonstrates a regular and accurate use of technical vocabulary, which improves its overall readability and maintains a professional tone. It conforms to the norms of academic writing, exhibiting meticulousness in the depiction of experimental procedures, findings, and interpretation.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are minor corrections that need to be addressed, which have been highlighted and discussed in the preceding sections and within the manuscript itself.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Obodo Basil Nnaemeka
Department, University & Country	Purdue University, United States