

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 Anticorectal 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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, it is important for scientific community.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No. The few of the references are not up-to-date, references of the last 10 years should be cited, please cite last 10 years references, especially references for the last 5 years.</p> <p><u>Apart from above mentioned 6 points, there are following problems to be corrected.</u></p> <p>1. The parts of the results and discussion should be separated. In addition, the part of discussion is not well discussed combined with results and references and should make some modifications.</p> <p>2. The tables should use the format of 3-line table, please revise the format of the tables to 3-line table, especially table 1.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is not fluent, suggesting that it should be edited by an English native editor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please make large revisions, especially in the part of results, discussion, references and language-editing. After making large revisions, the paper may be considered for publication</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Changping Li
Department, University & Country	Southwest Medical University, China