

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_123447
Title of the Manuscript:	Unravelling Tamoxifen's Neuroprotective Effects Against Manganese-Induced Neurodegeneration, Cognitive Impairment, and Hippocampal Damage via the Nrf-2 Pathway in Adult Male Wistar Rats
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	Human wherever subjected to neurological diseases, Neurodegenerative diseases risks increased more and more. This paper treated an important subjected about treatment of neurodegenerative disease induced with manganese and relieved with Tamoxifen. The author prepared a scholar paper, all details of doses used, and this confer the article more credibility.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is so attractive and agreed with paper content.	
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 resumes all subsections of the paper in a clear and simple manner and hints to coherent results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes as in introduction gave general idea about the disease, involvement of Mn in biological procedures and Tamoxifen properties. Method lacks some details about period between TMX and behavioural test, and material used for measuring absorption in biochemical analyses. Presentation of all results in details and their discussion gave more credibility to this paper, only if the author begins his discussion with a short paragraph reporting main results obtained related to objectives of this work.	
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.	As each step in method section progress with results to a more meticulous stage. It started with behavioural study with appropriate tests as Morris water maze and Y-maze tests interested in studying memory, then analyses of supernatants and finally, a detailed cell study of the tissue "hippocampus" involved in memorisation. The results confirm the correct choice of biochemical analysis parameters. All results are coherent and agreed as Tamoxifen treat memory damages caused by Mn.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	/	

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:	Rima Benatoui
Department, University & Country	Annaba University, Algeria