

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Neurology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORRIN_130414
Title of the Manuscript:	Microstructural, Immunoreactivity and Biochemical Studies of the Cerebellum After Artequin Administration in Adult Wistar Rats
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.	The manuscript investigates the potential neurotoxic effects of Artequin, a widely used antimalarial combination therapy, on the cerebellum. Its findings are significant for the scientific community as they provide insights into the potential dose-dependent adverse effects of Artequin on brain structures, including histopathological changes and oxidative stress markers. These results highlight the importance of understanding the neurological implications of antimalarial drugs, which is critical for patient safety, especially in endemic regions. Furthermore, the study contributes to the growing body of research on drug-induced neurotoxicity, emphasizing the need for careful dose management and monitoring in clinical applications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>The title of the article, "Microstructural, Immunoreactivity and Biochemical Studies of the Cerebellum After Artequin Administration in Adult Wistar Rats," is largely suitable as it accurately reflects the content and scope of the study. It mentions the subject of investigation (cerebellum), the experimental model (adult Wistar rats), the treatment (Artequin administration), and the areas of analysis (microstructural, immunoreactivity, and biochemical studies).</p> <p>However, to make the title more concise and engaging for the scientific community, a slight revision could be considered. For instance:</p> <p>"Neurotoxic Effects of Artequin on Cerebellar Microstructure, Biochemical Markers, and Immunoreactivity in Adult Wistar Rats"</p>	

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.	The abstract is comprehensive but can be improved by adding more context and specificity. It provides the aim, methodology, results, and conclusion but lacks sufficient background on the importance of studying Artequin's neurotoxic effects. Including specific quantitative results, such as P-values or fold changes, would enhance clarity and scientific rigor. Additionally, the dose-dependent effects mentioned could be elaborated on to clarify how the severity of changes varied across dosage groups. Lastly, the conclusion could briefly highlight the broader implications for clinical use or future research directions.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the methodology, results, and discussion provided. The study uses appropriate methods such as oxidative stress marker assays, histological techniques, and immunohistochemistry to assess the effects of Artequin on the cerebellum. The findings, including increased malondialdehyde levels, histopathological changes, and GFAP expression, are consistent with established knowledge of oxidative stress and neurotoxicity. However, a more detailed statistical analysis, clear articulation of sample sizes, and further discussion of potential confounding factors would strengthen its scientific accuracy. Overall, the manuscript provides reliable data but could benefit from more rigorous analysis and discussion for enhanced validity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with the 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i> The manuscript appears to address ethical considerations adequately. The authors explicitly state that ethical approval was obtained from the appropriate ethics committee	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Micheal Olatunji Avoseh
Department, University & Country	University of Delaware, USA