

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_74341
Title of the Manuscript:	A computational approach on the anti-biofilm effect of Ocimum sanctum bio-compounds against ptk of Acinetobacter baumannii
Type of the 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>Introduction:</p> <p>References quoted 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21: How these studies were helpful for study designing? All these references were unrelated to this study. Author should use only the very relevant references.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <p>Well described but retrieval and construction of protein is not remarkable</p> <p>Retrieval of structure of ptk gene</p> <p>The sequence of PTK from <i>Acinetobacter baumannii</i> was retrieved from NCBI database and the Biovia discovery studio visualiser was used to view the three dimensional structure of ptk gene (24). It was modeled using Swissmodel server using the template 3LA6 – A Chain.</p> <p>AUTHOR HAS TO JUSTIFY THE TARGET PROTEIN STRUCTURE USED IN THIS STUDY; BECAUSE STRUCTURE IS NOT YET DEPOSITED IN PROTEIN DATA BANK (PDB). Since the target protein is software constructed and not in the PDB, it lowers the credibility of this study.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Well described: but validity of the results to go for further studies is uncertain</p> <p>References and citations :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not done as per the journals instructions. Author should read the instructions and follow the same. 2. References number: 14, 15, 17,18, 19, 21: not related to this study. 3. Duplication of references 20 & 25 4. Citation of References 22 & 23: Not associated to the description of that line in the introduction 5. Reference number 24 not quoted anywhere in the article <p>Impression</p> <p>The aim & objective of the study is valid.</p> <p>Validity of the constructed protein structure is questionable</p> <p>Results obtained based on the constructed protein and its application in further study need not give the same outcome.</p> <p>Grammatical corrections to be done</p> <p>Quoting unrelated literature is not acceptable.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Indrajith Devandra
Department, University & Country	Jawaharlal Institute of Postgraduate Medical Education and Research, India