

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127634
Title of the Manuscript:	Unraveling the Medicinal Properties of <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> in Chicken Lymphocytes: Antioxidant and Immunomodulatory Perspectives
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>

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 valuable to the scientific community as it supports the traditional use of <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> by demonstrating its antioxidant and immunomodulatory effects through rigorous scientific methods. The study contributes to understanding the plant's bioactive properties and its potential in developing natural products for immune health. I appreciate the manuscript's integration of traditional knowledge with modern research, highlighting its potential for nutraceutical and functional food applications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. The title is generally suitable as it clearly conveys the focus on the medicinal properties of <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> and its effects on antioxidant and immunomodulatory functions in chicken lymphocytes.	
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 the article provides a clear overview of the study, effectively covering the plant's traditional uses, its antioxidant and immunomodulatory properties, the methods employed, and the key findings. However, a few revisions in abstract could enhance clarity and provide more depth. 1. The abstract could better emphasize the main aim of the study at the beginning, such as investigating the antioxidant and immunomodulatory effects of <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> 2. The results mention significant antioxidant activity and enhanced immune cell proliferation, but providing a bit more detail on the extent of the effect could strengthen the impact of the findings (e.g. the degree of comparison with control) could strengthen the result in abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust, employing well-established in vitro assays to assess both antioxidant activity and immunomodulatory effects of <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> . The use of the MTT assay to determine the Maximum Non-Cytotoxic Dose ensures reliable cytotoxicity data, while the Lymphocyte Proliferation Assay is a validated method for evaluating immune responses. The integration of traditional uses with modern experimental techniques strengthens the scientific foundation of the study. Overall, the methodology is sound, and the findings are credible	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Introducing plant as a promising candidate is engaging. 1. The inclusion of scientific references adds credibility. Ensure that all statements, especially those related to the bioactive compounds and their effects, are well-supported by citations. 2. Ensure uniformity in the reference section by standardizing the date format. In some references, the month is included along with the date, while in others, the month or date is missing. Please correct this inconsistency by adding the month and/or date where available, or by omitting them entirely for uniformity. 3. Reference no 12 font size changed __here THE PLANT TINOSPORA CORDIFOLIA IS A MEDICINAL RESERVOIR-A REVIEW	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes language is good and easily readable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In Material method: subheading:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hydroxyl Radical scavenging Assay should be Hydroxyl Radical Scavenging Assay 2. Superoxide Dismutase (SOD) should be Superoxide dismutase (SOD) <p>In DPPH Radical Scavenging Assay: This assay measures the ability of antioxidants with hydrogen-donating capacity to reduce the alcoholic DPPH solution should be This assay measures the ability of antioxidants with hydrogen-donating capacity to reduce the alcoholic DPPH (2,2-Diphenyl-1-picrylhydrazyl) solution. Beause initially need to write its chemical name then used DPPH as it is.</p> <p>Subheading: NO Scavenging Assay should be Nitric oxide (NO) scavenging assay</p> <p>In Discussion and conclusion: <i>T. cordifolia</i> should be <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> for uniformity of name in overall manuscript. <i>antioxidative defences</i> should be Food materials promote antioxidative defenses in the human body</p> <p>Result: in table no 3., Antioxidant Potential of MAE or this may be Antioxidant Potential of TCE, If MAE so write full form and mentioned in paragraph. please correct.</p> <p>3.3.5. DPPH Radical Scavenging Assay This assay measures the ability of antioxidants with hydrogen-donating capacity to reduce the alcoholic DPPH solution. The results revealed that the ability of TCE to scavenge DPPH radicals increased with higher concentrations, as illustrated in Figure 2 (C) and Table 4. In abstract you mentioned significant difference but in result also mentioned significant difference compared to control or write P value</p> <p>The due approval of this study was procured from Institutional Animal Ethics Committee, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India (IAEC/CBSH/MBGE/313)</p> <p>Authors not mentioned in manuscript. Please write yes or No, competing interest in manuscript</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jubershaha S. Fakir
Department, University & Country	Savitribai Phule Pune University, India