

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_92057
Title of the Manuscript:	In silico screening of potential compounds from Medicinal plants by targeting Streptococcus mutans deoxycytidylate deaminase
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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:

<https://www.journalpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Reviewer's General Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is sufficiently robust, technically sound, interesting and will gain a large number of readers <p>Reviewer Comments for Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The second paragraph of your introduction would be better added to your discussion 2. At the end of your introduction you need to describe the objective of your work <p>Reviewer Comments for Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dear author, it is necessary to add the inclusion and exclusion criteria in your methodology. 2. Its methodology lacks description of ethical considerations and more clearly about the sample used 3. It is necessary to cite figure 2 in the text. <p>Reviewer Comments for Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data is well controlled and robust 2. Statistical were sufficient and appropriate 3. The first paragraph of your topic Results is about your rationale and purpose 4. Your RESULTS topic should start in the second paragraph of the text present in the Drug-likeness prediction topic <p>Reviewer Comments for Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. References are relevant and current 2. The facts and figures are real 3. In your discussion you mention that you obtained results from 3 phytochemicals, 2 phytochemicals were not toxic in nature, you need to specify which are these phytochemicals <p>Reviewer Comments for Conclusion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The conclusion is supported by the manuscript data. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Jamille Silva Nogueira
Department, University & Country	State University of Campinas-São Paulo, Brazil