

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Archives of Current Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_123110</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>In Vitro And In Silico Analysis Of Amentoflavone Against Candida Albicans With A Competitive Action In Relation To Amphotericin B</b>
Type of the Article	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- The reference at the end of the paragraph is not right. Reference should be added at the end of each scientific information. This comment also to the discussion.</li> <li>2- References used to support the information in the first paragraph are not suitable and need to be replaced with those related to the characters and pathogenesis of Candida.</li> <li>3- The reference style for order references needs to be corrected. Ex. [1,2] replaced with [1-2] and so on to the other.</li> <li>4- Puncture and grammar are weak in many places in the text. Please, check all statements.</li> </ol>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The manuscript entitled (IN VITRO AND IN SILICO ANALYSIS OF AMENTOFLAVONE AGAINST Candida albicans WITH A COMPETITIVE ACTION IN RELATION TO AMPHOTERICIN B) tried to prove that amentoflavone (AMT) more effective as antifungal agent against C. albicans. The turnover of plants as natural sources of antifungals has no expiration date. The manuscript needs a major revision based on the following comments.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Subtitle of Background is missing.</li> <li>2- Plant should be added to the method</li> <li>3- Isolation of AMT is not by TLC as the first step. It is by column chromatography as mentioned in the methods. So, the information should be corrected.</li> </ol>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p><b>Methods:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- The name of the plant should be written in full in the first place.</li> <li>2- Some print mistakes are present such as (amt) in small letter</li> <li>3- We don't have the number of Candida written as 05, 5 is enough.</li> <li>4- What the number 2.5–5x10<sup>3</sup> CFU mL<sup>-1</sup> means. Please, replace it with a normal number. Do you mean 0.000025 x 10<sup>3</sup>.</li> <li>5- What is the origin of AmB?</li> </ol>	
<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Results:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- What is the unit of MIC in Table 2? The results of the same MIC are different from those in Table 1.</li> <li>2- There are two columns of combination between AMT and AmB. It is supposed to be one column. The results of these columns were also different. Please, explain that.</li> <li>3- The conclusion states that (Amentoflavone showed antifungal activity against all strains of C. albicans with better results than standard amphotericin). The results of the study showed that the MIC of AMT is more than that of AmB. Explain that or modify the statement.</li> </ol>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p><b>References:</b></p> <p>Some references should be organized to be similar to others. Ex. reference 5. The title of the paper is in capital letters. Please, check the others.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

### **PART 2:**

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ali Abdul Hussein S. AL-Janabi
Department, University & Country	University of Karbala, Iraq