

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122913
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of antioxidant activity and DNA damaging protection capacity for some herbal supplements
Type of the Article	Research Article

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)
<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>This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the antioxidant and DNA protection properties of herbal supplements, which are increasingly being used for their potential health benefits. Understanding these properties is crucial for validating the efficacy and safety of these supplements, contributing to evidence-based medicine. The manuscript is particularly valuable because it combines multiple assays to offer a comprehensive evaluation, which enhances the reliability of the findings. I appreciate the manuscript for its methodological rigor and its potential to bridge the gap between traditional herbal medicine and modern scientific research.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Estimation of Antioxidant Activity and DNA Damaging Protection Capacity for Some Herbal Supplements" is clear and descriptive, effectively conveying the main focus of the study. However, it could be made more engaging and specific by emphasizing the evaluation aspect and the significance of the findings. An alternative title could be:</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>Background: A brief introduction to the relevance and importance of the study. Objective: A clear statement of the study's aim or purpose. Methods: A summary of the key methodologies used, such as specific assays or experimental approaches. Results: A concise presentation of the main findings. Conclusion: The overall significance of the findings and their implications for the field.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections within Major Sections: Consider adding subsections within major sections (e.g., breaking down the "Methods" into "Sample Preparation," "Antioxidant Assays," and "DNA Protection Assays") to improve readability. Reordering for Clarity: Ensure that the methods section is detailed enough before presenting results, so readers understand how the data were generated. This may involve reordering or expanding certain parts.</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 robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive approach to evaluating both antioxidant activity and DNA protection capacity using well-established assays. The use of multiple, complementary methods, such as the DPPH and Comet assays, adds rigor and reliability to the findings. Additionally, the careful sample preparation and detailed statistical analysis ensure that the results are both accurate and reproducible. The manuscript's thoroughness in correlating antioxidant activity with DNA protection further strengthens its scientific validity, making the conclusions drawn both credible and impactful for the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-</p>	<p>Suggestions for Additional References: If the manuscript lacks references from the last 2-3 years, consider suggesting the inclusion of more recent studies that might provide updated insights or novel methodologies. If certain well-known studies in the field are missing, recommend their inclusion to strengthen the manuscript's scientific foundation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript should avoid ambiguity and clearly convey the research objectives, methods, results, and conclusions</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>NA</p>	

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:	Shoheb Shaikh
Department, University & Country	Siddhi's Institute of Pharmacy, India