

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORRIN_124031
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF STACHYTERPHETA JAMAICENSIS ETHANOL EXTRACT ON LIFESPAN, OXIDATIVE STRESS AND NEUROTOXICITY IN TRANSGENIC DROSOPHILA MODEL OF PARKINSON'S DISEASE
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it explores the potential therapeutic effects of <i>Stachytarpheta jamaicensis</i> ethanol extract on a transgenic <i>Drosophila</i> model of Parkinson's disease. By focusing on lifespan, oxidative stress, and neurotoxicity, the study provides valuable insights into the mechanisms of neuroprotection and the potential for developing treatments for Parkinson's disease. I appreciate this manuscript for its innovative approach and the use of a well-established model organism, which enhances the reliability and relevance of the findings. However, a more detailed discussion on the extract's bioactive compounds and their specific roles could further strengthen the study	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is good. Authors can consider this one also – "Therapeutic Potential of <i>Stachytarpheta jamaicensis</i> Ethanol Extract in Mitigating Lifespan Reduction, Oxidative Stress, and Neurotoxicity in a Transgenic <i>Drosophila</i> Parkinson's Disease Model". The scientific name should always be in italics.	
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.	Conclusion (in bold format). A little bit more information about <i>Stachytarpheta jamaicensis</i> will make the abstract background more robust. Result section should be modified with data of Parkinson's severity scale (if any) and with mean \pm SD for all the exact P values (if available).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes they are 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.	This manuscript's thorough experimental design and utilisation of a well-researched transgenic <i>Drosophila</i> model for Parkinson's disease give it a scientifically solid and technically sound appearance. The investigation's focus on longevity, oxidative stress, and neurotoxicity offers a comprehensive method for deciphering the ethanol extract of <i>Stachytarpheta jamaicensis</i> ' possible therapeutic uses. Additionally, the findings' validity is strengthened by the use of suitable controls and statistical analysis. Reproducibility is made possible by the thorough technique, which is essential to scientific study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	There is scope for more references for a original research article. I would suggest to add a few ref. for background and discussion section	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Please look into the punctuations carefully	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Swagata Sarkar
Department, University & Country	University of Calcutta, India