

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_89038
Title of the Manuscript:	Computational screening of medicinal plant phytochemicals to discover potent inhibitors against Hepatitis B virus
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-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	non	
Minor REVISION comments	non	
Optional/General comments	<div><ul style="list-style-type: none">The article is original and display an innovation by using recent research techniques.The title informative and relevantReferences are relevant, recent and appropriate key studies are included.The research question is properly outlined.The conclusions give a clear answer of the study aim. The authors give a clear conclusions.Also, the study limitations give opportunities for future research.<p>I have found the study design answered the aim appropriately and added new information.</p><p>I have found the topic is very interesting and the article is written in good language. In the attached file, you will find the detailed comments.</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">The article is original and display an innovation by using recent research techniques.The title informative and relevantReferences are relevant, recent, referenced correctly and appropriate key studies are included.The research question is properly outlined.All the study methods are reliable, valid and reproducibleThe data are presented in an appropriate way in the form of tables and figures. Also, definite unites, rounding and numbers are utilized. Titles, columns and rows are labelled in a clear correct way.I have found the text in result section added to the data presented. Also, statistically significant results are presented clearly. Practically meaningful results are understood clearly.The results are discussed from multiple angles and placed into context.The conclusions give a clear answer of the study aim. The authors give a clear conclusions supported by results and references. Also, the study limitations give opportunities for future research.I have found the study design answered the aim appropriately and added new information.<p>This is an engaging article with robust structure and logical display of related data that increase our knowledge of the subject.</p></div>	<div>Modified as suggestion</div> <div>Comment accepted and considered</div>

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	