

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_125616
Title of the Manuscript:	NEUROPROTECTIVE EFFECTS OF HEINSIA CRINITA AND COCONUT WATER IN A SCOPOLAMINE-INDUCED ALZHEIMER'S MODEL IN ALBINO RATS: BIOCHEMICAL CHANGES, CELLULAR HEALTH, AND NEURONAL ACTIVITY
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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The importance of this research can help to better understand the molecular and cellular mechanisms involved in Alzheimer's disease, and investigate biochemical changes, cellular health, and neural activity simultaneously. However, the use of animal models for complex human diseases such as Alzheimer's has inherent limitations, as the pathology in mice may not accurately reflect the complexities of the human condition. The scopolamine-induced model is a simplified representation that may not capture all aspects of Alzheimer's disease. Furthermore, while natural compounds are attractive, standardization and quality control can be challenging and potentially affect the reproducibility of results. This study likely focused on short-term effects, whereas Alzheimer's is a chronic, long-term disease.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Overall, the existing title is suitable as it effectively communicates the key elements of the study: It specifies the substances being studied (Heinsia crinita and coconut water). It mentions the model used (scopolamine-induced Alzheimer's model in albino rats). It outlines the main areas of investigation (biochemical changes, cellular health, and neuronal activity). However, if we were to suggest a slightly more concise alternative that still captures the essence of the research, we could propose: "Neuroprotective Potential of Heinsia crinita and Coconut Water in a Rat Model of Alzheimer's Disease: A Multifaceted Analysis"</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract presented is fairly comprehensive and covers the key information of the study. However, some suggestions can be made to improve it: 1. Adding information: - The total number of animals studied and the number of animals in each group - Duration of treatment - More details on cognitive assessment methods that may have been performed - Brief mention of any side effects or safety observed 2. Improving the structure: - Integration of "Purpose" and "Study Design" sections to avoid repetition - Presenting the results in a more concise and accurate manner, focusing on statistically significant findings 3. Clarification: - A brief explanation of how scopolamine induces cognitive impairment similar to Alzheimer's - Providing a short explanation about the importance of MDA and GPx in the field of Alzheimer's 4. Delete: - Very specialized details such as the exact name of the department can be omitted</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the structure and subsections of the manuscript are generally appropriate. 1. Add a short "Introduction" section before "Purpose" to provide a brief background on the importance of Alzheimer's research and the use of natural therapies. 2. Merging "Objective" and "Study Design" in one section called "Objective and Study Design" to avoid repetition and create a better connection between the objective and the method of conducting the study. 3. Expanding the "Results" section to subsections that correspond to the specific objectives of the study.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears to be scientifically sound and technically sound in several respects: 1. Study design and use of a randomized controlled trial design 2. Comprehensive methodology: study from a combination of different techniques including histological analysis, immunochemical evaluations and biochemical tests. 3. Using related indicators: checking MDA levels and GPx activity and using GFAP staining to evaluate astrocyte activation. 4. Measurable results Some possible weaknesses of this study: 1. Limitation of the animal model 2. Duration of the study: the 8-week treatment period is relatively short 3. Lack of dose-response evaluation 4. Limitations in behavioral assessments 5. Limitation in generalizability 6. Failure to investigate possible side effects 7. Restrictions on gender diversity</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Sources are acceptable, Of course, source number 10 was for the year 2026.....how.....</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is somewhat acceptable It is better to check with a language expert to be sure	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The necessary items are listed in the table	

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:	Farah Nameni
Department, University & Country	Varamin Pishva Branch , Islamic Azad University, Iran