

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_127584
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of restraint stress and cadmium administration on cerebral antioxidants in female Wistar rats.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 addresses a crucial intersection of environmental toxicology and stress biology by exploring the combined effects of cadmium exposure and restraint stress on cerebral antioxidants. Its findings contribute to the growing body of knowledge about oxidative stress and neurological damage induced by heavy metals and chronic stress. The study's results could have implications for understanding human neurological health in environments with high cadmium exposure..	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the Aim: Specify that the study evaluates the interaction of restraint stress and cadmium toxicity. Clarity and Conciseness: Reducing repetitive phrasing, such as multiple mentions of "significant (p<0.05) decrease," to streamline readability. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results: Adding descriptive subheadings (e.g., "Antioxidant Enzyme Activity," "Histological Findings") could improve readability. Methods: Provide more detail about the restraint stress protocol (e.g., wire mesh dimensions) to enhance reproducibility. 	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The decrease in antioxidant enzymes like SOD, CAT, and GPx is consistent with known oxidative stress pathways. The histological findings support biochemical results, strengthening the manuscript's overall reliability. The discussion successfully links the findings to broader implications, although additional exploration of potential molecular mechanisms would be beneficial. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is generally well-written but could benefit from minor grammatical corrections and rephrasing for clarity. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replace "resulting to" with "resulting in" in the introduction. Use consistent tense throughout the paper (e.g., "Results observed in Fig. 1 suggest..."). 	
Optional/General comments	The inclusion of institutional guidelines is commendable, but a sentence confirming ethical approval specific to the experimental protocol would strengthen compliance transparency.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abhijith S
Department, University & Country	Manipal Academy of Higher Education, India