

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_81901
Title of the Manuscript:	INTEGRATING INSILICO WITH IN VITRO STUDIES OF RUTIN AS AN ANTI HYPERTENSIVE
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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-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	This manuscript brings interesting results for the potential from rutin as antihypertensive. These results were based in molecular docking (bioinformatics methods) and it was done an in vitro assay to evaluated the ACR inhibitor activity. In the literature it was found some articles that shown a biological data about. However, the bioinformatic methos are an interesting approached used by authors and it should be emphasized better as a potential tool for discovery new drugs.	
Minor REVISION comments	The English should be checked word spelling as well, some words were together. The title should be changed considering to emphasize the molecular docking as a potential for screening rutin potential for activity. Abstract should be re-writing, the authors used the protein structure that were deposited at PDB, and it is confusing in the abstract Introduction – ok Methods should only explain how was done, and it is important to have all the parameters used in different software (cut off). Results it has to describe the figures and tables; it should point out what the reader should observed in figures and tables. The impression that it gives the authors only put the figures and tables and it is a problem from the reader to understand all. Legends should describe the figures, for example what colours represents, and others details to understand the figures. Discussion – the authors may point out the importance of the results obtained considering the different results in the literature. The authors mixed results with discussion Conclusion – the authors emphasized the new results that theirs work brought to scientific world. Figures need to improve resolution. For example, figures 1 and 2 was not possible to understand the draw	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Katia Castanho Scortecchi
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil