

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_105571
Title of the Manuscript:	Towards the Discovery of Lead Anticancer Agents: An In silico Exploration of Crinine Alkaloids for Cytotoxic, Caspase-3 Activating and Anti-Angiogenic Compounds
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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.journalajocs.com/index.php/AJOCS/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)

Review Form 1.7

<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>1- The research has a scientific interest, relevant data, and clear writing.</p> <p>2- I suggest a short title: "Lead Anticancer Agents of Crinine Alkaloids: Cytotoxic, Caspase-3 and anti-angiogenic exploration."</p> <p>3- The abstract is clear and comprehensive.</p> <p>4- The subsections and structure of the article are suitable. However, figure 1 "Structures of Crinine alkaloids under investigation" (page 5), is not readable. Also, the tables (1 to 5) are not clear. Suggestions: Change all the tables' layouts to suit the manuscript. Insert all abbreviations and their meanings in the table's legend. Indicate (using * for example) the statistical differences between the values.</p> <p>5- The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6- The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>Suggestions/Comments: Are there manuscripts demonstrating these lead compounds' biological effect? What does the literature say about them? Highlight the potential of future studies about these lead compounds.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality is suitable.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Congratulations to the authors for the manuscript. Some information should be added to increase the scientific rigor and a better understanding.</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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Beatriz Cardoso Roriz</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>State University of Tocantins, UNITINS, Brazil</p>