

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_118771
Title of the Manuscript:	In silico Docking Studies of Anti-malaria Potentials of the Phytochemicals in Chloroform Extract of Chrysophyllum albidum (star apple) Stem Bark.
Type of the Article	

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1-The manuscript is important to scientific community due to the spread and seriousness of malaria infection and the increasing susceptibility of drug resistance.</p> <p>2-The title is suitable, comprehensive but slightly long. An alternative can be " in Silico Analysis of Anti-malarial Phytochemicals from Chrysophyllum albidum Stem Bark."</p> <p>3-The abstract is comprehensive, summarizing the problem of malaria drug resistance, the study's aim, methods, key findings, and conclusion effectively. Mentioning the specific phytochemicals identified as potential anti-malarial agents in the results and conclusions is advised.</p> <p>4- The subsections and structure are appropriate. Each section logically follows from the previous one, providing a clear narrative from introduction to conclusion. The inclusion of figures and tables within the text, rather than just referencing them, would enhance readability.</p> <p>5- The manuscript is scientifically correct given the hypothesis, detailed methods and detailed results. Adding more details/defends on docking interactions and their implications to the discussion section is advised.</p> <p>6- The references are generally sufficient, big part of them are recent but some are so old while there could be more recent references. Including more current studies on malaria drug resistance and recent advancements in molecular docking studies would be beneficial. Specific citations seem to be placeholders (e.g., "1", "2", "3") and need to be updated with actual references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable for scholar communications. Minor grammatic errors need proofreading by a native.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1- Methods: More details on GC-MS identification process and molecular docking visualization would provide greater depth to the methodology.</p> <p>2- Results: Including figures and tables within the text would enhance the manuscript's readability and comprehensibility.</p> <p>3- Discussion: Adding more details in the discussion regarding the identified phytochemicals' roles in anti-malarial activity.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Manar Keshk
Department, University & Country	Cairo University, Egypt