

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	Research

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 molecular docking result using Methyltrienolone as control drug showed that copaene gave the lowest binding score (-8.2 k cal mol ⁻¹) which is an indication that the plant could be a good drug candidate for prostate cancer control. Density functional theory calculations were performed on some of the compounds identified in the GC-MS analysis, the low values of the energy gap confirmed the chemical reactivities of the molecules towards the drug target. Generally, the values of the calculated quantum chemical descriptors indicated that the plant would be a good drug lead candidate.	
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, Abstract is good.	
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.	Methodology of work is appropriate, results seems to be robust.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	YES	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Suraj G. Malpani
Department, University & Country	Shivlingeshwar College of Pharmacy, SRTM University, India