

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_97980
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the efficacy of Herbal antidotes of Viper snakes through In-Silico docking analysis of their bioactive components targeting phospholipase A2
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.journalajrimps.com/index.php/AJRIMPS/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, Just needs a few corrections as mentioned under General comments. It is more appreciable, if Results and discussions can be presented together.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality can be improved.</p>	
<p>General comments</p>	<p>Even though the collection of information is good, the following corrections should be done in the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract – none of the sentence should start with a numerical value, <i>Insilico</i> spelling should be corrected. Introduction - Selection criteria of the plants, importance of H-bonds, which are mentioned in the Conclusion section were supposed to be given under introduction to explain the rationale of the work. Materials & methods – Table 1 is not needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolution of the selected protein is not given. Write clearly about how the 3D structures of the ligands were downloaded. In Docking - Affinity (grid) maps of <u>xx</u> Å grid – write the underlined Å. Bioactive ligands (6) structures are not provided in the manuscript. Results and discussion -can be put together. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure titles should be provided below the figures (for all). The units in Table 3, can be given in each column heading, instead of mentioning numerical values with units in each cell. Interacting amino acid residues can be given in table itself corresponding to each ligand. The functional groups of the bioactive ligands, which are responsible for the key binding interactions can be highlighted in the 'Results and discussion' section. Conclusion – The key findings of the work should be highlighted. The future scope of the 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>work other than <i>in silico</i> studies, such as <i>in vitro/in vivo</i> studies should be given.</p> <p>6. References – All are in 4-5 different formats. All should be in same format as specified in 'Author instructions'.</p> <p>7. Entire manuscript – <i>In silico</i> should be in Italics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- No space before & after full stop.- Subscripts should be taken care.- Capitalize the first letter of the sentence and avoid capitalization of words in the middle of the sentence (except for plant names & other nouns)- Plant names should be given in italics.- In case of multiple number of references, numbers should be given in a single parenthesis like (18, 19) instead of (18), (19).	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N. Swathi
Department, University & Country	Gokaraju Rangaraju College of Pharmacy, India