

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77943
Title of the Manuscript:	Antibacterial analysis of Withanolides from Datura innoxia
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>In my opinion paper is very interesting. In silico investigations is a very interesting, ecological, economical and ethical point of view. Authors collected descriptors of biological activity of withanolides from <i>Datura innoxia</i>, identified by ethanolic extract. In silico investigations are broad - Authors used many different tools for in silico researches, what proved their good research workshop. On the basis of different descriptors of biological and pharmacological activity and in silico determination affinity of investigated compounds to selected proteins. On the basis of the complete data for further experiment – investigation of inhibitory properties dinoxin B was selected. Authors showed inhibitory properties of dinoxin B against <i>S. aureus</i>.</p> <p>From the reviewer's objection I have a few comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In table 2, in abstract, in Fig. 1 there are 6 investigated substances. In the other tables are only 6 investigated substances (without daturacin). It is misconception of the authors or was the substance not taken into account for some reason? Daturacin was in Fig. 2 – it is description as daturalicin.</li> <li>2. The title in my opinion is misleading – it suggested that authors focused on antibacterial properties of substances. I suggested rethinking a title.</li> <li>3. It is proposition, but why authors investigated antibacterial properties of dinoxin A only in relation <i>S.aureus</i> not in relation <i>E.coli</i> ? In silico investigation were carried out against the two bacteria?</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In my opinion the order of substances in the tables should be the same – it is easier compare the results.</li> <li>2. Data in Tables 4 and 5 – too many decimal places. For the values obtained, in my opinion, two decimal places are sufficient – for MDCK (T.4) and BBB (T.5) – three decimal places.</li> <li>3. In page 5 (above the Table 4) authors write “As shown in Table.2, the absorption rate of Withametelin is more in all cases. Table 4” should be: As shown in Table.2 4, the absorption rate of Withametelin is more in all cases. <del>Table 4</del>”</li> <li>4. Discussed data for Fig. 2 authors write “with docking score -6.504 with Efflux Pump Protein(EPP) of <i>E.coli</i> and -5.92 with Penicillin Binding Protein(PBP) of <i>S.aureus</i>. (Fig.2).” In my opinion should be : with docking score 6.504 with Efflux Pump Protein(<del>EPP</del>) of <i>E.coli</i>(<i>5ENO</i>) and 5.92 with Penicillin Binding Protein(<del>PBP</del>) of <i>S.aureus</i> (<i>3HUM</i>). (Fig.2).</li> </ol>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

## Review Form 1.6

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Irena Malinowska</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Chemical Sciences, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Poland</b>