

Editor's Comment:

I have made a final decision for the paper entitled "IN VITRO EVALUATION AND MOLECULAR DOCKING ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL ANTICANCER COMPOUNDS FROM SYZYGIUM ALTERNIFOLIUM" : **Major Revision**

The paper entitled "IN VITRO EVALUATION AND MOLECULAR DOCKING ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL ANTICANCER COMPOUNDS FROM SYZYGIUM ALTERNIFOLIUM"

It is an very interesting subject approached but with the following mentions:

1. The abstract is very general described. It must be reconsidered and developed with the most important original experimental findings and with the most suggestive experimental data obtained by the authors during the experimental stages.
2. The bibliographic references (the numbers in square brackets) must be completely removed from the RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS section! The RESULTS and DISCUSSIONS must reflect only the experimental, original work of the authors, ONLY the experimental data obtained! The Bibliographic references should only be inserted in the general part of the Introduction possibly also in Materials and Methods section.
3. DISCUSSIONS section must contain only the authors original detailed comments about the experiments carried out, only their original interpretations about the experimental data obtained during the experimental stages!
4. The writing and addressing formula throughout the whole work should use the third singular person and must not use the first plural person (**Not " We"**).
5. A statistical analysis is mandatory to be conducted for! (like the ANOVA TESTS, calculating statistical significance, p value, t- student test and other parameters) ! Authors did not calculate nothing of these! They must realize such statistical analysis and introduce it to "Materials and Methods" paragraph and the obtained statistical results should be inserted in "Results and Discussion" section. A correct and detailed interpretation of the obtained statistical results is mandatory! Statistical analysis has the particularly important role of finally validating the obtained experimental results.
6. Conclusions are extremely short and without any significance, without any substance, Conclusions are generally described and must be improved! Conclusions must be also reconsidered because are poorly represented in the last paragraph of this paper, too general, very short (only two sentences) and superficially treated and does not suggest at all the main final obtained experimental results, neither the most important experimental findings!! In the CONCLUSIONS section, the authors must emphasize, highlight and comment the most important

obtained results during the experimental stages so that it could be clearly seen whether they have achieved their goals and objectives proposed!

7. I encourage the authors to make all the correctios to this work! It could be an very interesting topic!! Thank you!

Editor's Details:

Dr. Cristian-Catalin Gavat
Lecturer, University of Medicine and Pharmacy "Grigore T. Popa", Romania.