

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_123850
Title of the Manuscript:	The potencial anxiolytic and antidepressant effects of Alpinia zerumbet in elderly individuals
Type of the Article	REVIEW

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>
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.	This review summarise the use of medicinal plant in anxiety and depression. I like this review, the data represent by author satisfy the need of review. In my opinion, author must gave some more description of findings of animal study and clinical studies in tabular form with the details of what type of animal model used, what is the dose, what is extract or isolated compound, what is the parameter and outpour of study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No I not agree with the title as it mentioned din elderly patient. The data given by author is only two study on human and all other studies for animals, so title is not relevant with the data given My suggestions is made correction in Title	
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.	Abstract is OK for me	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes,	
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.	1. Describe the results of animal study in details and give its relevance with human study, 2. Author mentioned IL-6 and BDNF, but author did not explain the role of this components and how Alpinia plant reduces IL-6 and BDNF in anxiety and depression condition. 3. In one of the human study author mentions longevity, I suggest to author that describe this parameter more details that how Alpinia helps in longevity, are Japanese people use Alpinia in their diet etc need more description	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Require more references in description to prove the claims	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes quality of language is good	
Optional/General comments	Revision required and additions of some more relevant data as its is review that expect more detail summarizations of previously reported claims	

Review Form 3

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:	Manish B. Gagarani
Department, University & Country	India