

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_126492
Title of the Manuscript:	Neuroprotective role of zingerone: Investigation the effective doses of zingerone in lead acetate-induced brain dysfunctions in 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: 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>
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.	The research provides valuable insights into the neuroprotective role of zingerone. The manuscript is okay and can provide a good base for the advanced research. However, some improvements are necessary to improve its worth in scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title can be improved and if going to use to above one then changed investigation with 'investigating'.	
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 language in the abstract is very poor. Sentences are not making any sense, and the grammatical errors are also present. The first sentence of the abstract can be split into two sentences to make it clearer and easier to understand for the readers. Authors should write 'This experiment <b>was</b> ' not 'were' in the first line of the abstract. The sentence regarding the dosages is not making any sense, please improve. Provide the information regarding the collection of blood i.e., either rats were killed or not?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<b>Yes, The changes required are following.</b> <b>Introduction:</b> The language of the introduction is required to be improved. The introduction lacks any information about the problems that researchers are trying to solve. There is no significant information regarding lead acetate toxicity and brain dysfunctions. While writing an introduction, the problem should be discussed in the start of the introduction. <b>Materials and Methods:</b> Again, the English is very poor. What do you mean by 'sex experimental groups'? The strain of rats used in the experiment is missing. Authors should write 'Control group <b>was</b> administrated with sterile distilled water". What nonsense is this 'G1, G2, G3, G4, and G5 group of rats gavage dose as following respectively; 25, 50, 100, 150, 200 mg/kg. BW of Zingerone and sub-lethal (1/280 from LD50) of lead acetate to all groups' Please explain or improve it?	

Review Form 3

	<p>Authors should add the detail, how blood was taken, anaesthesia used while taking samples and either rats were killed or not? Also mention the ethical guidelines followed in this experiment.</p> <p><b>Results:</b> Authors should improve the language in the results. They have repeated same words again and again in a single paragraph i.e., showed. This practice is not encouraged in scientific writing.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> In first paragraph “The results were in agreement with” means what? What is LPO? The authors should write the role of oxidative stress in damaging various organs of the body. And the role of oxidative stress in lipid peroxidation and production of MDA. They can take data from here <a href="https://doi.org/10.61748/Zool.2024/06">https://doi.org/10.61748/Zool.2024/06</a> , and cite it in the text.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> The conclusion is very short. Improve it and also add the limitations of your study.</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 discusses the lead acetate induced brain damage, which is a huge problem. It proposes a natural remedy for treating those damages, which is obtained from ginger (an easily available plant). It can bring advancements in the field of alternative and complementary medicines.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, the reference are recent. However, some details can be added to make the manuscript more appealing.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the whole manuscript has language errors. They are needed to be removed before publishing this article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Naila Ghafoor</p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p>University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan</p>