

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_130736
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidant and Neuroprotective potential of Resveratrol in the reversal of aluminium chloride-induced Alzheimer-type neurodegeneration in adult 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>

Review Form 3

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.	Research in this manuscript shows how resveratrol may buffer the effects of aluminium chloride on Alzheimer-type neurodegeneration through rat experiments using Wistar rats. The growing worldwide incidence of Alzheimer’s disease makes this study contribute to developing new treatment options. The research findings could have critical applications for neuropharmacological studies while suggesting newer approaches to treat neurodegenerative diseases. The study results could enable researchers to conduct additional preclinical and clinical research examinations.	Thank you so much for the positive comment and this is a great encouragement for future research
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title seems appropriate, but a minor refinement for clarity is suggested: Revised Title: "Antioxidant and Neuroprotective Effects of Resveratrol in Aluminium Chloride-Induced Alzheimer-Type Neurodegeneration in Adult Male Wistar Rats.	The suggestion has been effected appropriately in the original manuscript
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 well-structured but should explicitly mention the statistical significance of findings (p-values) for key results. The methodology should include more details on neurobehavioral tests. The conclusion should emphasize the translational potential of the findings.	The statistical difference of ($P=.05$) has been properly inserted for key results. The neurobehavioral test done which is the Y maze and Morris water test were added The conclusion has been reconstructed to indicate the translational potential of findings
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The study design is robust, but further clarification on the sample size calculation is needed. The statistical methods (ANOVA with Tukey’s multiple comparisons test) are appropriate, but details on normality testing should be included. The results section should include effect size measurements where applicable	The sample size calculation has been appropriately addressed The normality testing has been properly addressed The effects size measurement has been included appropriately
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript cites relevant studies, but additional recent references (published within the last 3–5 years) should be incorporated.	More recent references have been incorporated for quality work
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is well-written but has minor grammatical inconsistencies. Terms like "ameliorative role" could be simplified to "therapeutic potential" for better readability. And Standardization of scientific terms (e.g., "AlCl3" instead of "aluminum chloride" in certain sections) is recommended.	The suggestion for correction of inconsistent grammar has been effected appropriately Standardization of scientific terms has been corrected appropriately
Optional/General comments	The discussion should compare findings with human studies to enhance translational relevance. And Ethical considerations should clarify whether the ARRIVE guidelines were followed or not.	Findings correlations to human studies has been properly addressed Ethical consideration were clarified appropriately in the methods section

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	Noted with thanks