

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_124225
Title of the Manuscript:	Curcumin improves cognitive function by restoration of neurotransmitter balance, attenuate oxidative stress, inflammation and improves hippocampal integrity in intestinal ischemia/reperfusion injury induced-cognitive deficit in aged female Wistar rats
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Although the work carried out is undeniable, its presentation as a scientific work has serious drawbacks. The authors establish a direct and unique relationship between IIR and brain damages, but they do not consider the role of the intestinal ischemia on the gut microbiome-brain-axis. A lot of studies have established the influence of this axis on mental disorders, including cognitive impairments. The work is difficult to follow due to the English grammar mistakes.	The study is at aimed at investigating how IIRI could affect the hippocampal function. However, to show that there is a link between the gut and the brain, it has been mentioned in the introduction. The manuscript will be proofread to correct any grammatical mistakes.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title must be shortened. For example: Effects of curcumin on cognitive impairment in aged female Wistar rats subjected to intestinal ischemia-reperfusion	Thank you for the title suggestion, it has adjusted to "effects of curcumin on cognitive impairment in aged female Wistar rats subjected to intestinal ischemia-reperfusion"
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 section must be rewritten, because is too long, and part of it might be transferred to the Introduction and Material and Methods sections. The authors must be more precise in the description of their experimental design and the results and conclusions obtained.	The abstract has been adjusted.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The Material and Methods section seems a lab protocol. The subsections may be grouped to better understand the methodology used. Not is established clearly why the treatment with D-galactose during 8 weeks induce the aging in rats. It should be included a reference.	Section 3.6 explains the step-by-step approach used to induce intestinal ischemia reperfusion injury in rat model. This was done for the sake of reproducibility. Also, the protocol used for the biochemical assays were reported Before the commencement of the research, D-Galatose was used to achieve aging in rats when administered at 200mg/kg for 8 weeks as reported by previous studies which has been cited in corrected version of the manuscript.
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.	The results, although robust, are not clearly presented, requiring numerical values of the means and standard deviation. Sometimes the reader is lost with the inadequate explanation of the results obtained. The work is technically correct. The micrographs corresponding to histological pictures must be improved. A paragraph should be included with the limitations of the study in discussion section.	Graph pad prism V 7 was used for data analysis and one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post hoc test with statistical significance set p<0.05. The value of significance as indicated in the analysis using graph pad prism V 7 has been indicated below the figure. Limitation of the study has been added.

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More actualized references must be cited. The cited references do not present a homogeneity of style and many are incomplete.	The referencing style has been adjusted in the revised manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	A complete review of English is necessary.	The manuscript has been revised by the anthors.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	