

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products
Manuscript Number:	Ms_SARJNP_125919
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of potential cancer inhibitors using Curcuma longa (Turmeric) extract through molecular docking, adme and DFT methods
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article presents a comprehensive study on the potential of Curcuma longa (Turmeric) as a source of cancer inhibitors. By employing molecular docking, ADME, and DFT methods, the researchers identified several compounds from Turmeric extracts that exhibited promising binding affinities with various cancer protein targets. The findings suggest that Turmeric could be a valuable resource for developing novel anti-cancer therapies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The methodology described in this manuscript is scientifically robust, employing established techniques for analyzing Curcuma longa (turmeric) leaves. The procurement, solvent extraction, and phytochemical screening using FTIR and GC-MS effectively identify bioactive compounds. The selection of cancer protein targets and the use of molecular docking with PYRX and AutoDock Vina are methodologically sound, facilitating meaningful predictions of ligand-receptor interactions. Additionally, utilizing SwissADME for assessing drug-likeness enhances the study's relevance. Overall, the approach is comprehensive and aligns with current scientific practices, contributing valuable insights to medicinal chemistry and pharmacology.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is written suitable for scholarly community, although some words is misspelled.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Marvel Reuben Suwitono
Department, University & Country	Universitas Advent Indonesia, Indonesia