

Review Form2

Book Name:	Recent Developments in Chemistry and Biochemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2859
Title of the Manuscript:	Sex-Dependent Effects of Aristolochic Acid on Kidney Injury in Mice
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript contributes significantly to the understanding of sex-specific differences in AA-induced nephrotoxicity. By demonstrating the protective role of testes against AA-induced renal damage, it provides valuable insights for developing targeted therapeutic strategies. The findings have implications for both clinical management and future research, potentially leading to improved outcomes for individuals exposed to AA.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the main findings of the study, highlighting the sex-based disparities in AA-induced renal injury and the involvement of testes in this process.	
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 provides a concise overview of the study, including the research question, methods, key findings, and conclusions. However, it could be further strengthened by quantifying the differences in renal dysfunction and tubular damage between male and female mice. Additionally, including a brief mention of the potential mechanisms underlying the protective effect of testes would enhance the abstract's informative value.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate and well-organized.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates a strong foundation in scientific methodology and analysis. The use of appropriate controls, statistical analysis, and clear interpretation of results contributes to the scientific robustness of the study. The authors have effectively addressed the research question and provided compelling evidence to support their conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references appear to be sufficient and recent, supporting the claims made in the manuscript. However, a review of the reference list could be conducted to ensure that all relevant and recent publications are included.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The language quality of the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, the manuscript presents a valuable contribution to the field of nephrotoxicity and demonstrates a high level of scientific rigor. The findings have important implications for both clinical practice and future research.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Azmath Unnisa Begum
Department, University & Country	Osmania University, India