

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_129478
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantum Chemical Calculation and In silico Molecular Modelling Studies on Some Multi-targeting Anti-Inflammatory Inhibitors
Type of the Article	Research

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	These studies provide valuable insight into molecular mechanisms underlying inflammation and the interaction between inhibitors and their target. It reduces the need for experimental synthesis and testing. The studies can also reveal new details about the complex processes involved in inflammation, ultimately, informing the development of more effective treatment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript	
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.	The whole BSTRACT should be rewritten following this FORMAT: Problem statement, aim, methodology, result findings in the same order that methodology was written and concluded.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The scientific content of the manuscript is robust and technically sound, but could be strengthened further by expanding the depth of the discussion. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized, but could be adjusted as Computational Details instead of Material and Methods	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More recent references between 2020-2024 should be used	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are some areas that could be improved through careful proofreading and rephrasing.	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript could be accepted with the minor revisions.	

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:	Terngu Timothy Uzah
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Petroleum Resources, Nigeria