

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_96992
Title of the Manuscript:	Insilico Study of Anticolorectal cancer properties of some flavonoids and Terpenoids from African Propolis
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://journalsarjnp.com/index.php/SARJNP/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>No. Anti-cancer Properties of Flavonoids and Terpenoids in African Propolis via Molecular Docking Study.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes but require elaboration</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. The references are not enough and should be written in a uniform manner as suggest by the journal.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No. May require proofreading.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The title of the manuscript is not in alignment with the research findings which only shows strong binding affinity and inhibit the PARPs development. Suggest to include these in the title.</p> <p>The abstract's content is ok. However, do not use abbreviations in the abstract. The abstracts sentences requires paraphrasing as the many of the sentences and phrases are too fragmented and making it difficult to read and not enjoyable. Would be better if sent for proof reading. Keep the keywords to a maximum of 5 and not 6.</p> <p>Introduction section also requires proof reading as the sentences are also too fragmented. However the contents are appropriate.</p> <p>The Method Section is too short. Requires elaboration. Describe the how the data analysis was done. State regarding the standard drugs used as comparison to the African Propolis used.</p> <p>The figures in the results section are not clear. It doesn't depict the results clearly as stated. Suggest to make it bigger and clearer. Discussion section is too weak. Search and elaborate other research findings in journals that are doing similar works to support or contradict its finding, in order to make the statement of the research findings more convincing.</p> <p>The conclusion is weak. Do not repeat the research findings in the conclusion section. Try to elaborate and relate in to the title and how it can be stated to have anti-colorectal cancer properties.</p> <p>All the best and good luck. The manuscript can be improved further.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Azmah Saat
Department, University & Country	Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia