

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_124587
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Determination of Astrocyte Reaction Using Glial Fibrillary Acidic Protein (GFAP) Following Aluminium Chloride Induced Hippocampal Damage Of Adult Wistar Male Rats Treated With Ethanolic Extracts Of Carpolobia lutea At Different Doses</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Alternative medicine is important for proposing therapies and new treatments for existing diseases and improving the quality of life of patients. I like the article because it deals with the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It proposes an alternative treatment for neurological diseases;</li> <li>- It aims to reduce morbidity;</li> <li>- It improves the quality of life of patients.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Carpolobia Lutea and Glial Fibrillary Acidic Protein (GFAP): Treatment of Hippocampal Injury by Aluminum Chloride.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract contains concise and clear information about the article. However, when reading it, it is easy to lose attention because the information is not very well separated and organized.</p> <p>I suggest the following: Separate the Objectives, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion and Conclusion in the body of the abstract and put them in bold. This will prevent the reader from getting lost while reading.</p> <p>I suggest putting the main objective of the article in the abstract as well.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The article's topics and subtopics should be numbered so as not to distract the reader, promoting order and separation between the topics.</p> <p>The topics should follow the same order of placement. If the author chooses to centralize the topics, they should all follow the same pattern. However, I suggest positioning the topics on the left side of the page.</p> <p>These suggestions are given as an example below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction</li> <li>2. Objective</li> <li>3. Materials and Methods             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1.</li> <li>3.2.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Results             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.1.</li> <li>4.2.</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Discussion</li> <li>6. Reference</li> </ol>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The scientific corrections can be seen in previous topics. The article presents very interesting and innovative considerations and contains data that can support the treatment. However, other considerations can be made.</p> <p>There is no need to write keywords, only the words used for research.</p> <p>It was not clear upon reading what the main objective of the author or authors was. The main objective of the article should be written in the body of the article text and in the body of the abstract.</p> <p>In the materials and methods, it was not clear where the references were collected from, what the methods were for including and excluding the articles, and which platforms were used.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>In addition, it is useful to highlight the randomization method chosen (Stratified? Simple?; among others) and whether it was a double-blind or triple-blind study.</p> <p>In the results, it would be interesting to highlight the number of animals that experienced side effects and/or positive effects from the use of the respective component tested in the treatment, facilitating the understanding of the positive and negative effects of the treatment.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p>:</p>	<p>There are not enough references for the article, and there are more recent references on the topic studied. When choosing the keywords "Aluminium chloride AND Hippocampus" and entering them into the PubMed search system, 19 articles were found in 2024 alone. It would be interesting for the author or authors to explore more recent articles on the topic studied.</p> <p>Since it was not reported which platforms were used, inclusion and exclusion methods, the number of articles found in total, and how many were selected for writing the article, it is difficult to suggest articles to the authors or the author.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The quality of the English language in the article is good for academic communications, however a review of spelling errors should be carried out for possible corrections.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The article is insightful and innovative and presents a different approach to the treatment of neurological diseases. However, more information needs to be explained in the article to make it better written and easier to read.</p> <p>I suggest that references be made using the Vancouver method. In addition, each sentence written by the authors should include a reference, except when it concerns the use of personal opinion, and the results found by the authors themselves.</p> <p>Figures should be better specified. For example: Group of figures 1, Group of figures 2, and so on.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Vinicius Benatti Freire</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nove de Julho University, Brazil</b>