

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_128170
Title of the Manuscript:	Local Leguminosae Profile Of Pea Pigeon (Cajanus Cajan) In Indonesia And Its Potential On The Bone Tissue Structure Of Female Rats
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>

#### **PART 1: 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</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improved Women's Health by Support for Menopause Symptoms &amp; Bone Health Enhancement.</li> <li>2. Promotion of Natural Alternatives side by side Reduced Dependence on Synthetic Hormones at Affordable Solutions.</li> <li>3. Cultural and Traditional Knowledge Preservation.</li> <li>4. Sustainable Agricultural Impact by Boosting Local Agriculture &amp; Utilization of Indigenous Crops.</li> </ol>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<p>"Exploring Indigenous Legumes of Indonesia: Pigeon Pea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i>) and Evaluating Its Impacts on Bone Tissue Structure in Female Rats"</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>"Analyzing isoflavone levels and evaluation of the estrogenic potential of pigeon pea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i>) on bone tissue structure in a preclinical model"</p>	
<b>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.</b>	<p><b>Aim-Objective &amp; Methodology is comprehensive as per abstract. Result and Discussion mut be more elaborative and clearer. It will allow readers to understand the project content without reading the full text</b></p> <p>The term "pigeon pie" is unconventional for <i>Cajanus cajan</i> and might confuse readers. Use "pigeon pea" instead.</p> <p>Improve sentence structure for readability. For example, "Blood 17<math>\beta</math>-estradiol analysis using HPLC method" could be rephrased as "Blood 17<math>\beta</math>-estradiol levels were analyzed using the HPLC method."</p> <p>Some grammatical errors need correction, such as "pigeon pie were" (should be "pigeon pea levels were").</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The results are reported numerically but lack statistical analysis. Indicate if changes in 17β-estradiol levels and bone tissue proliferation were statistically significant.          Avoid excessive abbreviations (e.g., P0, P1, P2) unless they are explicitly defined. Use more descriptive group names for clarity.          How the Dose decided and what was it, have to mention          Highlight any potential dose-response relationship between isoflavone levels and the observed effects. here stated that there is increased osteoblast and fibroblast proliferation but does not provide specific evidence or measurements. Quantify these changes or explain how they were assessed.          Address whether the observed estrogenic effects could be considered physiologically significant.          Ensure consistent formatting of units and values (e.g., use uniform decimal places for genistein and daidzein concentrations).          All figures must have caption at bottom or at top. The captions for Figures 1 and 2 are too descriptive and repetitive. Simplify captions to focus on key findings while referring readers to the main text for details. For Figure 3, include a quantitative comparison of osteoblast and fibroblast proliferation between groups.          While the mechanism of phytoestrogens is mentioned, the connection to observed effects (e.g., increased 17β-estradiol, osteoblast proliferation) is implied but not explicitly discussed. Explain how pigeon pea compounds enhance estrogen receptor binding and stimulate bone tissue.</p> <p>Explanation should be as- Blood samples from treated rats were analyzed for 17β-estradiol levels using the HPLC method. The control group (P0) exhibited 237.231 pg/ml, whereas treatment groups P1 (high-dose) and P2 (low-dose) exhibited significantly increased levels of 603.926 pg/ml and 486.153 pg/ml, respectively (Figure 2).</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>No of Citations are sufficient, which is good, but their formatting is inconsistent (e.g., "Drugarin, et al., 2003" and "Dixon, 2004"). Use a consistent citation style, such as APA or Vancouver.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>To comply with academic communication norms, the work must be edited for grammar, syntax, scientific tone, and clarity.</p> <p>Examples: (Suggested)</p> <p>"HPLC pigeon pie contained genistein 247,898 µg/g and daidzein 188,613 µg/g"</p> <p>Revise it as: "The HPLC analysis of pigeon pea revealed genistein and daidzein levels of 247.898 µg/g and 188.613 µg/g, respectively."</p> <p>"Bone tissue structure of white rat, HE staining, 100x"</p> <p>Revise it as: "Bone tissue structure of white rats visualized at 100x magnification using HE staining."</p> <p>Sentences are often fragmented or lack coherence. Use complete and logically connected sentences.</p>	

**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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Mohammad Rashid</p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p>R V Northland Institute, India</p>