Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Applied Life Sciences International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JALSI_85408**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Preliminary In-Silico Analysis and Molecular Docking of Active Compounds in Coriandrum sativum As Potential Drug Targets Against SARS-COV-2 Infection**
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://www.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/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	**Abstract** • Abstract should must be adjusted to the journal standard. • Do Libdock scores have units? • invitro should be write: *in-vitro* **Introduction** • Reference [1] should be referred before reference [2]. • The Latin name of organism should be write italic • In-silico should be write italic • Is it Figure 1 original figure or taken from literature? If it was taken from literature it should be given a reference and provide copyright license. Figure caption should write separated from figure. However, this figure has a low resolution and it is not for the publication. • In Introduction missing the description of chemical constituents of *Coriandrum sativum* related to the prevention of Against SARS-COV-2 **Highlights** are not needed in this journal. **Methods and Material** • Authors should write this section in chronological as the study was performed. The visualizationis the last phase. • Which softer was used fort the molecular docking? • **Phytochemicals of Coriander (Coriandrum sativum)** (page 4): It is not clear from the text, did authors performed their own analysis of chemical constituents of *Coriandrum* or the results were taken from literature. If the results were taken from literature, a references should be provided. • What is purpose of phytochemical screening of coriander leaf, stem, and fruit on group of chemicals, and after that listed the individual chemicals in the Table 4. Where are the references that provide such information? Besides, Table 4 should be transferee to the Supplement files. • It should be provide the the correct link to the OSIRIS Property Explorer's open-source program. • Is it Figure 2 and 3 results of the study? The caption of the figure are not describe correctly. The both present the active site with inhibitor, but what is the difference. If the figures are not the results of a study, they should be removed. **Results** • What are the units for Energy of docking? • The text at the page 20 should be part of the Methods section. • Discussion of docking scores are missing. • Declaration of competing interest is missing.	
Minor REVISION comments	Other: There are a lot of typographic errors such as excess spacing, uncorrect reference style etc.	
Optional/General comments	The article seems confusing, without serious lack of scientific values, and not clear aim of study. There are a lot of issues with formatting text and presenting the results of the study.	

Review Form 1.6

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)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Vesna Rastija**
Department, University & Country	**Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek, Croatia**