



Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_UPJOZ_3161</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EXPLORING NEOPHYTADIENE FROM <i>Ampelocissus araneosa</i>: A MOLECULAR DOCKING APPROACH TO INHIBIT BIOFILM FORMATION IN <i>Staphylococcus</i></b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b></p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b></p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the urgent need to combat antimicrobial resistance and biofilm production through the exploration of alternative remedies, such as plant extracts, as viable substitutes for antibiotics. The title of the article is suitable as it clearly reflects the focus of the study on exploring neophytadiene from <i>Ampelocissus araneosa</i> and its potential inhibitory mechanisms against biofilm formation in <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>. The abstract of the article is comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's aims, methods, and findings. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, effectively presenting the research methodology, results, and discussion. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, with a thorough exploration of molecular docking techniques and the potential of neophytadiene as a therapeutic agent. The references are sufficient and recent, providing a comprehensive overview of relevant literature in the field. However, additional references related to the latest advancements in antimicrobial research and drug discovery could further enhance the manuscript's relevance and depth.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The corrections were effected</p> <p>Revised</p>



<p>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><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>is it necessary to add druglikeness analysis (ADME and Toxicity by computerized) of compounds contained in Ampelocissus araneosa for herbal medicine</p>	<p>ok</p>
<p><b>Optional</b> comments</p>		

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