

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_128949
Title of the Manuscript:	IN-SILICO EVALUATION OF PHENYLISOCYTOSINE AND ITS ANALOGS AS POTENT INHIBITORS OF PLASMODIUM FALCIPARUM TRANSKETOLASE: A STRATEGIC APPROACH IN ANTI-MALARIAL DRUG DISCOVERY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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 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.	Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. It has described the detailed <i>In-silico</i> studies of PHENYLISOCYTOSINE AND ITS ANALOGS	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It is clear, concise, and informative	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In methodology section: It is almost incomplete. Discuss more about the method used in the investigation, in brief In conclusion you use the term of preclinical studies, it is a vague term, its better to reframe that point In graphical abstract check for the structure and name of both thioxopyrimidinone and pyrimidinedione –please correct it 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is sound, and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner. But some correction needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draw the attention of readers through the whole introduction toward your aims. And then express the aim in the last paragraph of the introduction. In this section 2.2 Preparation of Ligands no need to again and again mention this point-This <i>in silico</i> study focused on phenylisocytosine and its analogs, which were evaluated as potential antimalarial agents In methodology- after Molecular docking validation(2.3) continue with 2.5 molecular docking tools and then write about Physicochemical, Pharmacokinetic and Toxicological Profiling follow the same order in Results section also Table 3: it should contain only what the following table tells you not the comparison of the analogues. Make it more concise Table 3 : provides information about the three ligands and a reference drug, but in table reference drug is written first –correct it Figure 2. Molecular interaction between the three ligands and the reference drug at the active site of plasmodium falciparum transketolase (8R3Q) but in the figure reference drug is first ----correct the sentence in Figure 2 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes they are sufficient	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, I think the manuscript is well-written and informative Please make the suggested changes.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dimple Pirgal
Department, University & Country	KLE College of Pharmacy, India