General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdj-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)
### PART 1: Review Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer’s comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Compulsory REVISION comments** |  - Many grammatical errors should be corrected  
- There is a sentence in the results page 6 should be clarified  
- The symbol a,b under figure 1 should be mentioned and clarified  
- Figure ligand of fig 3 should be changed (see manuscript)  
- The number of mice in each group should be increased to double |
| **Minor REVISION comments** |  - Some words as via, in vivo, curcuma longa should be italic  
- The keywords should involve antioxidant activity  
- Reference of curcumin doses should be added |
| **Optional/General comments** |  - The references should be updated  
- Materials and methods should include some recent markers of oxidative stress (AGEPs) and inflammatory mediators should be included (TNF-alpha, IL1 beta)  
- The discussion should be clarified  
- The mechanism of action in details |
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