

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JMSRR_120835 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Molecular docking, ADMET and DFT, investigation of the prostate cancer inhibition potential of Cinnamomum zeylanicum |
| Type of the 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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|--|---|
| Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The study is useful and techniques used for investigation are very good | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | Yes | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes | |
| Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | For carrying out study techniques used are robust. Hence results obtained can be considered as authentic. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. | Yes | |
| Minor REVISION comments | Ok | |
| Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>Whether authentication of <i>Cinnamomum zeylanicum</i> was done?, as it is most important feature in phytochemical investigation. If yes report it in manuscript.</p> <p>Protein Data Base(PDB) instead it is mention as PBD correct it.</p> <p>Name of Second Compound In GC-MS result is not completely written</p> <p>IR is fingerprint of each compound. Whatever IR spectrogram is provided how the interpretation of 31 compounds is done? IR containing 31 compounds cannot be as simple as IR presented. Same is case with GC-MS. Please Justify.</p> <p>Plant as a whole can't be used as drug target. Make change in conclusion as on the basis of various investigations the plant can be a good source of finding lead structure where by further investigation can be done.</p> | |

Review Form 3

PART 2:

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Sachin Ashok Pishawikar |
| Department, University & Country | New College of Pharmacy Uchgaon, India |