

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_73475
Title of the Manuscript:	Ascertain of Antihypertensive Bioactive Compounds from Rosemary and Hawthorn; a Molecular Docking Study.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is quite interesting, not only for its scientific content but for its relationship with traditional medicine. The act of taking a local treatment and reviewing its potential <i>in silico</i> has added value. The work fulfills what it promises in its objective, which is to review the inhibition potential of the enzyme ACE responsible for hypertension by the bioactive compounds present in Rosemary and Hawthorn, through the use of molecular docking. However, the manuscript could explore a little better the phytochemical characteristics of plants and the traditional method to treat hypertension, as it is only vaguely mentioned in the introduction and methodology. In addition, it requires revising the text, for a better understanding and fluency.</p> <p>Note: A similar manuscript is found in Preprints, but directed to covid-19. You can review it as a differential model. Link: https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202003.0226/v1</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The lack of use of punctuation marks makes it a bit difficult to understand the text. Like the phrase in the introduction “therefore, the research and development to find a safer, more innovative and economical treatment was necessary to start with the new phase of drug development based on natural herbal medicines in order to get out of the current synthetic method which costs more expensive and requires sophisticated materials in addition to a significant amount of time consumed during the development”. I suggest placing a period between the old idea and the new one “...treatment was necessary. to start with”, of course, it requires modifying the text for consistency. Also, I recommend removing “the” of the part “therefore, the research...”. 2. In methodology, words are repeated in the same sentence without added value such as “Rosemary (<i>Rosmarinus Officinalis</i>) is a plant popularly known as rosemary”. I recommend removing a Rosemary from the sentence. 3. In botanical nomenclature, the abbreviation of the plant descriptor after the binomial scientific name is used as a writing criterion. In this case it corresponds, <i>Rosmarinus officinalis</i> L. and <i>Crataegus laevigata</i> (Poir.) DC. 4. The manuscript does not provide much information on plants, it lacks data on their biological properties and general chemical characteristics. It is not very clear in the text which specific part of the plant the bioactive compounds were chosen to be analyzed claim, whether it is fruit, leaf, stem, root, or a whole. In addition, it is mentioned that the criterion of the <i>in silico</i> analysis was based on oral administration. Did you think of this as if it was administered in the form of an infusion or a decoction? It would be interesting to explore a synergistic effect. Most of the selected molecules from plants are known for their antioxidant activity, Does the author believe that they are related to the antihypertensive effect? 5. The conclusion to my perspective is somewhat extensive and complex, it contains too much external information. As a suggestion, I would recommend removing all the information not provided by the article and highlighting the anti-hypertensive potential of the plants studied, especially the quinones (Rosmaquinone and Rosmaquinone B) that do not have any description of the aforementioned activity. The last paragraph of the conclusion is more interesting. 	

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	Interesting, open to future manuscripts.	
---------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alvaro José Hernández Tasco
Department, University & Country	State University of Campinas, Brazil