

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_124422
Title of the Manuscript:	Therapeutic Potential of Methanolic Stem Extract of Costus afer on Serum Uric Acid, Tumor Necrosis Factor-alpha (TNF-α), and Interleukin-6 (IL-6) Levels in Monosodium urate (MSU)-Induced Gouty Arthritis in Wistar Rats
Type of the 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>
<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 style="text-align: center;"><u>Therapeutic Potential of Methanolic Stem Extract of <i>Costus afer</i> on Serum Uric Acid, Tumor Necrosis Factor-alpha (TNF-α), and Interleukin-6 (IL-6) Levels in Monosodium urate (MSU)-Induced Gouty Arthritis in Wistar Rats</u></p> <p>Major comments</p> <p>1. Clarity of Research Question and Aim (Introduction): The introduction does a good job of explaining the condition being studied, but the research gap could be made clearer. Right now, it's not entirely obvious what makes this study stand out compared to previous research. Highlighting the unique aspect of this study, particularly in relation to how plant extracts are being used for gouty arthritis treatment, would help underscore its significance.</p> <p>2. Statistical Interpretation (Results Section): The results present statistically significant findings, but there's room to elaborate on the clinical relevance—particularly with respect to TNF-α and IL-6 levels. Explaining what the observed reductions in these markers mean in practical, therapeutic terms for gouty arthritis would provide valuable context for readers.</p> <p>3. Phytochemical Results (Table 1 and 2): The phytochemical data in Tables 1 and 2 is presented clearly, but it would be helpful to discuss the importance of each compound in more detail. For example, linking specific phytochemicals like flavonoids or phenols to the anti-inflammatory effects you observed could enhance the discussion.</p> <p>4. Antioxidant Activity Section: The antioxidant activity is reported well, but discussing the IC50 values in comparison to standard antioxidants would give a clearer sense of their role. How might these values contribute to the anti-inflammatory or anti-hyperuricemic effects observed in the study? This would help readers better understand the extract's therapeutic potential.</p> <p>5. Inadequate Explanation of Experimental Controls (Methods Section): There's not enough detail about the control groups in the experimental design. For instance, it would be helpful to clarify the differences between the control (non-MSU-induced) group and the MSU-induced untreated group. Clearer definitions will make it easier for readers to follow the baseline comparisons.</p> <hr/> <p>Minor Comments:</p> <p>1. Abstract Conciseness: The abstract is informative but could be trimmed slightly. For example, the sentence "TNF-α and IL-6 levels, which are the key biomarkers associated with inflammatory and metabolic disorders like gouty arthritis" could be shortened without losing its meaning. Reducing repetitive content will improve readability.</p> <p>2. Repetition of TNF-α and IL-6 Mechanisms (Introduction):</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>The explanation of TNF-α and IL-6 mechanisms appears several times in the introduction. It would be more effective to consolidate these into a single, well-rounded explanation to avoid redundancy and create a smoother narrative flow.</p> <p>3. Reference Formatting (Methods): Ensure that all citations in the methods section (e.g., [22], [23], [24], [25], [26]) follow the same format and adhere to the journal's guidelines. Consistency is key for a professional appearance.</p> <p>4. Formatting Errors in Phytochemical Tables (Tables 1 and 2): There's a potential formatting issue in Table 1, where “++” is repeated under terpenoids. It's also important to avoid redundant symbols in the key to enhance clarity.</p> <p>5. Explanation of IC50 in Antioxidant Activity: The IC50 values for the methanolic extract, ascorbic acid, and gallic acid are provided, but it might be useful to briefly explain what IC50 represents, especially for readers who may not be familiar with this term.</p> <p>6. Sentence Structure (Discussion): Some sentences in the discussion section are a bit complex and may be hard to follow. For example, "These nature's gift to mankind is rich in phytochemicals" could be simplified for clarity. Using straightforward sentences will improve the overall flow and make the discussion more accessible.</p> <p>7. Missing ELISA Kit Details (Methods): The methods mention the use of ELISA kits for TNF-α and IL-6 measurements but don't include specific catalog numbers for the kits. Providing this information would improve the reproducibility of the study.</p> <p>8. Typographical Errors: There are a few minor typos, such as "IC50" being repeated twice in the antioxidant section. Fixing these small errors will help maintain a polished and professional presentation.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</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>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</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>		

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sumitha Elayaperumal
Department, University & Country	JSS Academy of Higher Education and Research, India