Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Applied Life Sciences International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JALSI_89706**
Title of the Manuscript:	**IN SILICO AND IN VIVO BIOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF CHENOPODIUM QUINOA ON SCOPALMINE INDUCED MEMORY IMPAIRMENT IN MICE**
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:

(https://www.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/editorial-policy)

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	1. The manuscript needs English editing. Numerous errors exist in the manuscript. Professional English checking and writing are recommended. 2. Abstract part for results did not show the in vivo results, while in methodology only explains about in vivo. Keywords need to be adjusted to the title. Please rewrite the abstract and add the missing points. 3. Methods for preparing an ethanolic extract of Chenopodium quinoa (Soxhlet) are a little confusing because there is a maceration process too, do you use both of them? The author needs to revise and add more detailed information in methods such as the version of the software, docking parameters, and docking validation. For example, in preliminary phytochemical analysis of the extract is not really explained well. 4. Results for in silico is not 100% clear. The author must explain the docking validation results. The interaction between ligand and receptor needs to be elaborate with amino acid mapping and analysis. The essential amino acids in the binding site should be determined. 5. What purpose of Ramachandran plot validation for 1EVE, 6N33, 2FV5, and 6W2X? If the author creates homology models, then they must validate using the Ramachandran plot. 6. In the discussion part, the author should add and make correlations with the previous study. Statistical analysis and in vivo lack explanation in this part.	
Minor REVISION comments	1. Revise the image for the docking section, the color of ligand and amino acids in the receptor should use different colors to make them recognize easily. Add the image to show the position of the ligand in the binding site. Hydrogen bond distance in the image should determine in Angstrom units and find the correlation with the docking results. 2. The author needs to add units for docking results (for example -10.67 kcal/mol). 3. Scientific names should be in *italic* form.	
Optional/General comments	The entire manuscript is good. The topic is very interesting because the author uses Chenopodium quinoa active compounds to reveal their potential for anti-amnestic. However, some explanation seem to be missing, the author should revise and complete them.	

Review Form 1.6

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Fadilah**
Department, University & Country	**Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia**