

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_130418
Title of the Manuscript:	Antioxidative Potentials of Telfairia occidentalis Aqueous Leaves Extract in Cyclophosphamide Induced Oxidative Stress in Adult Wistar rats (Rattus norvegicus)
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.	The study investigates the neuroprotective effect of TO against cyclophosphamide induced neurotoxicity, which is relevant and timely topic. The study also explores the role of oxidative stress and inflammation in neurotoxicity, which is a critical area of research in neurodegenerative diseases.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is well structured and effectively communicates the research question.	Ok
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The first two sentences (Aim, study design) are identical, which is unnecessary. Redundant information should be removed.Balance the abstract by highlighting the study's significance, implications and potential applications.Review the abstract for grammar and punctuation to insure clarity.	ok
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Study design is suitable to evaluate the effect of Telfairia occidentalis aqueous leaves extract (TOAE) on cyclophosphamide (CP) induced neurotoxicity in rats.The methods for biochemical evaluation are clearly described.The manuscript mentions statistical analysis but it lacks detailed information about the specific statistical test used.Results are accurately interpreted.Findings are consistent with the existing knowledge in the field.	Revision made accordingly
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes reasonable number of references however, more recent references should be included to reflect the latest development in the field.	Added

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are several grammatical and punctuation mistakes. Some sentences lack clarity.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure consistent formatting throughout the manuscript.• Review and correct grammatical and punctuation errors.• Breakup long sentences and rephrase unclear sentences.• Provide a clear justification for the selected doses of CP and TOAE.• Provide representative images of the cerebellum from each group to illustrate the histological changes.• Why study time is mentioned in manuscript? What is the significance of these months for this specific research?	Done revision

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	