

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCR_130504
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Green Tea and Honey on Creatinine Kinase and Troponin Levels in Albino Wistar Rats exposed to Atrazine
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. The title could be more specific and highlight the protective effects of green tea and honey. Including terms like "cardiotoxicity" or "protective effects" would make it more relevant and easier to find in searches.	Corrected
	2. The abstract would benefit from a stronger emphasis on the broader implications of the findings, a mention of limitations, and a brief outline of future research directions.	It was mentioned
	3. While the introduction is informative, it doesn't fully explore gaps in previous research or provide enough mechanistic explanations for the effects of green tea and honey.	
	4. Ethical approval is mentioned but lacks specific details such as protocol numbers or the name of the approving committee, which are necessary for clarity and transparency.	No specific ethical committee for the se of laboratory animals in the facility where the study was carried out.
	5. The rationale behind the doses of green tea and honey used in the study is missing. It would help to explain whether these were based on previous studies or preliminary experiments.	
	6. While the tables are effective, adding visual elements like bar or line graphs would make the trends in CK and troponin levels easier to interpret.	It has been added.
	7. The discussion overlaps slightly with the results section and could use more critical interpretation of the findings. Addressing limitations, such as small sample size and variability in natural product composition, would add depth.	Authors think that the presentation of mean, standard deviations and the inferential statistics values are adequate for any reader to make their evaluations.
	8. The mechanistic insights into how green tea and honey protect against cardiotoxicity could be expanded to provide a more comprehensive understanding.	Corrections have been made.
	9. The references need updating, as many are outdated. Including more recent studies, especially post-2015, would strengthen the manuscript's relevance and scientific foundation.	
	10. The conclusion could be more impactful by emphasizing how this study addresses gaps in research and its practical applications. Suggestions for future research would also enhance this section.	
11. Minor grammatical errors and formatting issues, such as inconsistent spacing in tables, should be corrected through careful proofreading to meet publication standards.		
Final Comment:		
Implementing these corrections will enhance the article's scientific precision, clarity, and relevance, making it more robust and impactful. By addressing gaps in methodology, data presentation, and		

Review Form 3

	references, the study will align better with academic standards. Additionally, emphasizing broader implications and practical applications will increase its value to researchers and practitioners. These improvements will ensure the article makes a stronger and lasting contribution to the scientific community.	Grammatical errors have been corrected
--	--	--

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	No ethical issues