

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 Tinospora cordifolia 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript proves once again the phytochemical compounds present in <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> . According to the results of the study, <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> can be used to manufacture immunostimulating products. The study might stimulate innovative ideas in the pharmaceutical and food industries.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not enough scientifically strong according to the tests that have been carried out. The work is not a survey but an experimental study. Suggestion: Antioxidant and immunostimulant activities of <i>Tinospora cordifolia</i> stems in chicken.	
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.	Yes.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The methodology is scientifically clear. The results are well presented. The discussion is clear and relevant to the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but are not enough recent. The references' style must be changed (APA). Scientific names must be <i>in italic</i> . We suggest the following recent studies on the pharmacological activity of the theme to improve references: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Xu, M., Ren, J., Jiang, Z., Zhou, S., Wang, E., Li, H., ... & Jiao, L. (2024). Structural characterization and immunostimulant activities of polysaccharides fractionated by gradient ethanol precipitation method from Panax ginseng CA Meyer. <i>Frontiers in Pharmacology</i>, 15, 1388206. ➤ Dermane, A., Kporvie, A. K. G., Kindji, K. P., Metowogo, K., & Eklugadegbeku, K. (2024). Immunomodulatory and anti-inflammatory activities of hydro-ethanolic extract of <i>Securidaca longipedunculata</i> Fresen leaves. <i>Journal of Herbmmed Pharmacology</i>, 13(2), 280-288. ➤ Tenda, P. E., & Ramadhani, A. P. (2024). Immunostimulant Activity of Moringa Leaves (<i>Moringa Oleifera</i> Lam.) Combined with Lime Peel (<i>Citrus Aurantifolia</i>) in Vitro. <i>Journal of World Future Medicine, Health and Nursing</i>, 2(1), 160-169. ➤ Bogolitsyn, K., Dobrodeeva, L., Samodova, A., & Parshina, A. (2024). In vitro Immunostimulant Activity of the Polyphenolic Extract from the Arctic Brown Algae <i>Fucus vesiculosus</i>. <i>Plant Foods for Human Nutrition</i>, 1-7. ➤ Setiani, L. A., Wiendarlina, I. Y., Rizkyani, N. A., & Fazri, S. A. (2024). Immunostimulant Effects of Bitter Leaves (<i>Gymnanthemum amygdalinum</i> (Del.) Sch. Bip. ex Walp.) Leaf Extract. <i>Jurnal Kefarmasian Indonesia</i>, 212-222. 	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality of the manuscript is correct. Figures 2 (A and B) should be reviewed because they are blurry.	
Optional/General comments	No plagiarism is detected. Yes, scientific procedures are correct according to standards	

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:	Kporvie Atsu Kodjo George
Department, University & Country	University of Lomé, Togo