



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3489
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular Docking and ADMET Study of Phytochemicals as Anticancer Agent towards Alpha 1-Antichymotrypsin Variant DBS-II and Oxidised Quinone Reductase-2
Type of the Article	

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Yes, this is an intriguing article in which a computational approach based on molecular docking was used to investigate some naturally occurring chemicals to search for possible binding interactions. ❖ Yes, the title properly explains the purpose and objective of the article, ❖ Yes, the abstract offers an accurate summary of the paper, and the language used in the abstract is easy to read and understand. However, the objectives need to be rephrased for greater clarity. ❖ Yes, the manuscript is well designed and appropriate in terms of structure and organization. ❖ Yes, the manuscript is scientifically outstanding. ❖ References: Yes. ❖ Abbreviations should be defined at first 	<p>Thank you for your review and suggestions for improvement. I have carefully considered your feedback and have made the recommended changes accordingly. Your input has been valuable in enhancing the manuscript.</p>



<p>and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>mention and used consistently thereafter (ADMET,).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Tables and figures: Clear and comprehensive. ❖ Please rephrase some of the paragraphs of the discussion and conclusion for more clarity. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ English needs to be improved 	
<p><u>Optional</u> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ None 	

PART 2:

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