Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Cardiology Research
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJCR_130051**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effects of Dichlorvos Oral Treatment on Cardio protective and Atherogenic Indices of New Zealand White Rabbits.**
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**Indices of New Zealand White Rabbits"** addresses key relevant topic, especially considering the widespread and the use of dichlorvos as a pesticide and its potential cardiovascular implications. The study is methodologically sound, and it focuses on cardioprotective and atherogenic indices as indicators of toxicity is appropriate. However, there are areas where the manuscript could be improved in clarity, depth, and presentation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		

Review Form 3

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.	**Abstract** • The abstract provides a good overview of the study but could benefit from more precise language regarding the results. For instance: o Instead of "Dichlorvos oral exposure caused changes (decrease) in cardioprotective index (AAI) with significant alterations or increases in the Atherogenic indices," you might consider: ▪ "Dichlorvos oral exposure significantly reduced the cardioprotective index (AAI) and increased atherogenic indices, with the most pronounced changes observed at 90 days ($p < 0.05$)." • Including specific p-values or a brief mention of statistical significance in key results would strengthen the abstract's impact.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	**Introduction** • The introduction provides a solid foundation for the study but could benefit from highlighting the research gap more explicitly. For example, “explain why previous studies may not have adequately explored the chronic effects of dichlorvos on cardiovascular health”. Consider elaborating on the public health relevance of the findings, especially in regions where dichlorvos use is prevalent	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	1. **Statistical Analysis**: o While the statistical methods are appropriate, it would help to mention whether assumptions for ANOVA (e.g., normality and homogeneity of variance) were checked. o If possible, provide more context for why Tukey’s Post Hoc test was chosen.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	**Additional Comments** 2. **Language and Style**: o Avoid redundancy in descriptions, such as repeating "10% of the LD50 dose" multiple times. o Simplify technical jargon where possible without losing precision to make the manuscript accessible to a broader audience. o Ensure consistent terminology throughout, such as using either "cardioprotective" or "cardiac protective," but not both.	
Optional/General comments	**Methodology** • The description of the experimental animals is clear, but it would help to justify the choice of sample size. Why were 24 rabbits deemed sufficient for this study? This would provide a stronger basis for the experimental design. • The explanation of dichlorvos administration is clear but slightly repetitive. Streamlining this section and standardizing the units (e.g., consistently using mg/m³ or mg/dL) would improve readability. **Results and Discussion** • The figures referenced in this section are informative, but the captions need revision. Some captions are duplicated (e.g., Figures 3 and 4) and do not provide enough detail to stand alone. Each figure should have a unique, descriptive caption explaining its content and significance. • The discussion draws meaningful connections between the findings and existing literature. However, you could expand on the potential mechanisms through which dichlorvos exposure affects lipid metabolism and cardiovascular health. • Including a brief discussion of the study's limitations—such as the potential differences between rabbit physiology and human implications—would enhance the critical evaluation of the findings. **Conclusion** • The conclusion summarizes the results effectively but could include more actionable insights. For example: o Suggest avenues for further research, such as exploring protective interventions or examining similar effects in other animal models. o Highlight potential regulatory or practical implications of the findings, such as stricter controls on dichlorvos use in agricultural settings.	

Review Form 3

	This study provides valuable insights into the cardiotoxic effects of chronic dichlorvos exposure. The suggestions above aim to enhance clarity, strengthen the manuscript's presentation, and ensure that the findings have the greatest possible impact. •	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Stephen Ngigi Mburu**
Department, University & Country	**Kenyatta University, Kenya**