

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_125528
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINATION OF ANALGESIC POTENTIAL OF CYCLOHEXANONE DERIVATIVES (DIBENZYLIDENE-ACETOPHENONE ANALOGS) USING MICE
Type of the 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.	The manuscript explores the analgesic potential of cyclohexanone derivatives using established pain models in mice, which is significant for developing new pain management agents. It offers insight into potential analgesics with fewer side effects, crucial for improving patient outcomes, particularly in chronic pain conditions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable for the research	
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 is fairly comprehensive, providing a clear summary of the background, aim, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, it could benefit from further conciseness and clarity, particularly in the methodology section, where the doses and models used are a bit too detailed for an abstract. The key findings are well-highlighted, making it accessible to readers.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's subsections follow standard scientific formatting, with Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. These are appropriate and align well with the scientific structure expected in pharmacological studies. However, some subsections, particularly within the results, might benefit from additional clarification in tables and figures for better readability.	
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.	the manuscript adheres to scientific principles. It uses standard pain models (hot plate and tail flick models), follows ethical considerations, and applies appropriate statistical analyses (ANOVA). The inclusion of dose-response relationships and time-course evaluations adds depth to the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cover relevant studies and methodologies, particularly regarding pain models and the chemical properties of the compounds being tested. However, some references appear a bit dated or generalized, and the manuscript could benefit from more recent literature on analgesic research to strengthen the discussion section.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is ok except for a few typo error. The author will have to do some more proof before submitting	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Akwasi Antwi-Kusi
Department, University & Country	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana