

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_128704
Title of the Manuscript:	PROTECTIVE EFFECTS OF SELECTED ANTIOXIDANTS ON THE LEAD-INDUCED THROMBOCYTOPENIA IN MALE WISTAR RAT
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>

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 write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the protective effects of antioxidants against lead-induced thrombocytopenia. By analyzing the impact of lead toxicity and the restorative potential of Vitamin C, Vitamin E, and Levamisole in rats, the study highlights the role of antioxidants in mitigating platelet-related damage caused by lead exposure. The findings emphasize the therapeutic potential of these substances in improving platelet parameters, offering a foundation for further research on antioxidant interventions in lead toxicity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is mostly clear.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive as it includes all the essential components of a scientific abstract. However, it can be slightly refined for clarity and flow. Consider summarizing the methodology slightly to focus only on key details (e.g., group names and exact dosages can be simplified). Highlight the most significant results to make the impact more straightforward.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct. The objective is clearly stated, and the study design is scientifically sound, and logical findings. It only needs minor revisions for improvement. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Streamline the background to reduce redundancy. Ensure proper citations for all claims. Include details of statistical analysis to validate significance. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant to the study. Out of 20 references, several are older than 10 years. Thus, it is recommended that more recent studies be included. The author can retain older references for foundational concepts but prioritize new studies for updated findings.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical issues that need to be improved.	
Optional/General comments	Here are comments to address key areas in the manuscript for clarity, structure, and improvements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript describes platelet indices and their clinical relevance. However, the background section could be streamlined by briefly summarizing these indices instead of providing lengthy explanations. Ensure consistent usage of terms such as "thrombocyte indices" and "platelet indices" throughout the text to avoid confusion. For instance, in some places, thrombocyte and platelet are used interchangeably, which could disrupt clarity. The results discussion is comprehensive but dense. Consider breaking this section into smaller paragraphs or adding subheadings (e.g., Acute, Sub-acute, Chronic Phase) to improve readability. Some references are mentioned generically (e.g., "studies by other groups of researchers" or "others"). Replace these with specific author names or citation numbers. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>5. There is limited mention of the statistical analysis. Clarify how the statistical significance was determined (e.g., p-values, confidence intervals) to show the validity of the results.</p> <p>6. Certain points, such as the roles of antioxidants in reducing oxidative stress, are repeated across multiple sections. Streamline these discussions to avoid redundancy.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nurul Aqmar Mohamad Nor Hazalin
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia