

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_113266
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative In Vitro Cytotoxicity Evaluation of "Moringa Extract, Clitoria Extract and Cocciniagrandis" by MTT Assay using L-929, Vero, L-132, Raw 264.7 and Balb 3T3 Cell Lines
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it presents promising findings on the anti-cancer properties of herbal extracts and their potential therapeutic effects on neurodegenerative diseases, along with determining safe usage concentrations.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the article, including the specific substances being evaluated, the method used (MTT assay), and the cell lines employed for the cytotoxicity assessment.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive as it summarizes the aim, methods, findings, and conclusions of the study regarding the cytotoxicity evaluation of the mentioned herbal extracts and their potential application in treating cancer and neurodegenerative diseases.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and the structure of the manuscript seem appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound with no major errors.</p> <p>6. The number of references is not enough, and more new references should be used.</p> <p>7. The introduction should be written more so that a more complete overview of the research of other scientists' papers is mentioned in it.</p> <p>8. Use "Figure 1" instead of "Plate 1". Figure 1, the resolution for all images and their captions should be increased. In Figure 1, it is mandatory to mention explanatory details for the interpretation of the microscopic images.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the language/English of the article is suitable to a certain extent for scientific communication, but it is necessary to revise and edit it professionally.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	-	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Kamyar Shameli
Department, University & Country	Institute of Virology, Technische Universität of München, Germany