



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3161
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLORING NEOPHYTADIENE FROM <i>Ampelocissus araneosa</i>: A MOLECULAR DOCKING APPROACH TO INHIBIT BIOFILM FORMATION IN <i>Staphylococcus</i>
Type of the Article	Original Research 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? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (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 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>1- Yes, this manuscript has some importance to pharmacognosy and microbiology field as it assesses the antimicrobial effect of a phytocompound.</p> <p>2- Yes, the title looks suitable but the name of bacteria should be written in full.</p> <p>3- Yes, the abstract looks comprehensive.</p> <p>4- Yes, the manuscript is structured in the correct way.</p> <p>5- From my point of view, I think the manuscript has some flaws for example I am wondering why authors didn't used a crystalized icaR protein (3GEU). Also, why authors used metronidazole and not other antibiotics as a control? And why they didn't assess the plant extract against bacterial isolates by well diffusion method for example.</p> <p>6- The references are recent but some paragraphs are missing citation.</p> <p>7- I am wondering why authors used patchdock server as it commonly used for protein-protein docking.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Effected revision</p> <p>Revision made</p>



Minor REVISION comments	Some abbreviations should be stated in the manuscript.	Noted
Optional comments		

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>	