

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_123287
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Hepato-protective activity of Bixa Orellana plant 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 <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>The manuscript outlines a clear objective to evaluate the hepatoprotective properties of Bixa orellana. However, the hypothesis could be better articulated. A more explicit statement regarding the expected outcomes and underlying mechanisms would enhance the clarity of the research purpose.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title is suitable for this article</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>Abstract is comprehensive</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Including a comparison with other studies on hepatoprotective agents could strengthen the discussion. This would help to contextualize the findings of this study within the broader field.</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 study aims to provide insights into the potential therapeutic benefits of this plant extract for liver health. The methodology section provides a detailed account of the experimental procedures. If it is possible include the liver function test of GGT and bilirubin.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all references are up-to-date and relevant. There are a few references that could be replaced with more recent studies or additional pertinent literature. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript generally adheres to scientific writing standards, but some sections could benefit from grammatical and stylistic revisions. Proofreading for clarity and conciseness is recommended.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	K.A.Jeyanthi
Department, University & Country	India