

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_129346
Title of the Manuscript:	IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF NEUROPROTECTIVE EFFECT OF A BUTANOL EXTRACT FROM CENTELLA ASIATICA (L.) URB
Type of the Article	Research

#### **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: 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)
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 neuroprotective potential of <i>Centella asiatica</i> . By utilizing advanced DNA barcoding techniques and identifying bioactive compounds through cell-based assays, the study strengthens the scientific foundation for its application in neurodegenerative disease treatments. The demonstration of significant acetylcholinesterase inhibitory and neurotrophic effects in preliminary screenings exhibits <i>C. asiatica</i> 's therapeutic promise. This research contributes to the growing body of evidence supporting herbal plants as viable alternatives or complements to conventional neuropharmacological treatments.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are typographical errors and inconsistent use of scientific terms, such as "neurdegenative" instead of "neurodegenerative," and inconsistent italicization of <i>Centella asiatica</i> . Methodological details are insufficient in some areas, including limited information on sample replicates and controls in assays like TLC and neurite outgrowth. Statistical methods are mentioned but lack clarity, particularly regarding adjustments for multiple comparisons. Figures are missing essential details, such as representative morphological images (Figure 1A) and scale bars in microscopy images, while figure legends need more comprehensive explanations. The study focuses on the butanol extract's activity but does not provide enough comparative detail on why other extracts performed poorly. Additionally, the discussion does not adequately address limitations, such as the high IC50 value or the challenges posed by phytochemical variability in plant extracts.	

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sinchana S Bhat
Department, University & Country	Srinivas College of Pharmacy, India