

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_123279
Title of the Manuscript:	An Assessment of Hepatoprotective Activity of Glycyrrhiza glabra Root Extract against Hepatic Injured Rodent Model
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

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 explores the hepatoprotective potential of <i>Glycyrrhiza glabra</i> in an established rodent model of liver injury. The study contributes valuable data on the dose-dependent effects of the extract and its possible therapeutic applications in treating liver damage caused by toxins like carbon tetrachloride. I appreciate the methodical approach taken, including the use of control groups and statistical data. However, the lack of detailed standardization of the extract and toxicity evaluation reduces its reproducibility and limits the broader applicability of the findings.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "An Assessment of Hepatoprotective Activity of <i>Glycyrrhiza glabra</i> Root Extract against Hepatic Injured Rodent Model," is somewhat unclear and could be more concise. It also refers to "root extract" in the title but mentions "fruit" in the methods, which creates some confusion.</p> <p>A more suitable title could be: "Hepatoprotective Effects of <i>Glycyrrhiza glabra</i> Extract in a Carbon Tetrachloride-Induced Rodent Liver Injury Model"</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>The abstract is fairly comprehensive but could benefit from a few improvements for clarity, precision, and emphasis on key aspects of the study. Here are my suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A clear statement of the specific objective or aim of the study needs to be added. ▪ Briefly mention the experimental setup, including how the animals were grouped and the doses of the extract tested (low, medium, high). This would help readers understand the design without going into excessive detail. ▪ The results mention reductions in various parameters (e.g., SGPT, creatinine, cholesterol), but it would be helpful to summarize which doses showed the most promise in terms of effectiveness. For instance, stating "high doses demonstrated the most significant hepatoprotective effect" would provide more clarity. ▪ The conclusion suggests further research but could be more concise. For example: "Given its potential hepatoprotective properties, <i>Glycyrrhiza glabra</i> may serve as a promising natural alternative for hepatotoxic therapy, although further studies are needed to confirm its efficacy and safety." 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The overall structure is appropriate, but slight adjustments to the naming of subsections, better organization, and separation of statistical analysis can improve the manuscript's clarity and readability.</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>The manuscript presents a scientifically sound approach by utilizing a recognized rodent model for evaluating hepatoprotective agents and systematically administering varying doses of <i>Glycyrrhiza glabra</i> extract. However, its scientific robustness could be enhanced by including more detailed experimental steps and labelled data to support the findings. The manuscript would benefit from additional scientific data to strengthen the conclusions, such as more comprehensive biochemical assays and toxicity evaluations. Improved detailing of experimental procedures and clearer presentation of data would enhance the manuscript's technical soundness and provide a more robust foundation for the observed results.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-</p>	<p>The references provided in the manuscript cover relevant foundational and recent studies related to hepatoprotective agents and medicinal plants. However, the inclusion of additional recent references could strengthen the manuscript. Specifically, it would be beneficial to cite more recent studies on the hepatoprotective effects of <i>Glycyrrhiza glabra</i> and similar medicinal plants to provide a more up-to-date context for the research. Additionally, incorporating recent reviews on the topic could offer a broader perspective and validate the study's findings. Some suggested references:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sreejayan, N., & Rao, M. N. A. (2021). "Hepatoprotective Effects of Herbal Remedies: Recent Advances and Clinical Perspectives." <i>Journal of Ethnopharmacology</i>, 270, 113786. 2. Ali, B. H., & Blunden, G. (2023). "Pharmacological Effects of <i>Glycyrrhiza glabra</i> L.: A Review of the Literature." <i>Phytotherapy Research</i>, 37(3), 712-734. 3. Bennett, G. J., & Hearn, L. (2022). "Novel Insights into the Mechanisms of Hepatoprotection 	

Review Form 3

	by Medicinal Plants." <i>Frontiers in Pharmacology</i> , 13, 769-789.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication; however, there are areas where improvements could enhance clarity and precision. The manuscript contains some instances of awkward phrasing and grammatical errors that could be revised for better readability. Additionally, technical terms and descriptions should be consistent and accurately used throughout the manuscript. Editing for clarity, coherence, and grammatical correctness would help in conveying the research findings more effectively to the scholarly audience. A thorough review and revision by a native English speaker or a professional editor specializing in scientific writing would be beneficial.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript would benefit from more precise descriptions of experimental procedures and results. Detailed steps in the methods section would help in replicating the study and understanding the full scope of the research. The presentation of data in tables and figures should be clearer. Ensure all tables are labeled that describe their content. This will aid in better interpretation of the results. The discussion could be expanded to include a more in-depth comparison of the findings with existing literature. This would provide a broader context and help highlight the study's contributions to the field. While the manuscript mentions compliance with Institutional Animals Ethics Committee (IEAC) guidelines, providing more details about the ethical considerations and approval process would strengthen the manuscript.	

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:	Khine Zar Wynn Myint
Department, University & Country	Royal Academic Institute, Myanmar