

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_122504
Title of the Manuscript:	Neuroprotective potential of the hydroethanolic extract of Lannea microcarpa's fruit on oxidative stress induced Alzheimer's disease.
Type of the Article	Research

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.	This rigorous on inhibitory potential against two enzymes enhanced the credibility on diabetes research and underscore significant research gaps in this field of study. Therefore, this manuscript can be considered as important for the community	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable	
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.	No changes needed, since abstract is concise and clearly explained.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is appropriate	
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.	Author has well-conceived the manuscript "Neuroprotective potential of the hydroethanolic extract of <i>Lannea microcarpa</i> 's fruit on oxidative stress induced Alzheimer's disease" by addressing neuroprotective effect of using <i>Lannea microcarpa</i> 's fruit and its high antioxidant property. The methodology is constructive and clearly defined by the author. Results are evidently presented as graphs which aid in effective interpretation. Concise conclusion by the author has summarized key findings and significance of the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	It is sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is a minor change required in figure 5. Description where the author has mentioned AH 1, 2 et 3. Replace "et" with "and". Why standard deviation is missing on DPPH graph? Kindly check.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is written well by author but minor changes as mentioned are required.	

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:	Gayathri. P
Department, University & Country	Sri Ramakrishna College of Arts and Science for Women, India