

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_88750
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIHYPERTENSIVE AND IN SILICO DOCKING STUDIES OF PHYTOCONSTITUENTS ISOLATED FROM SYZYGium ALTERNIFOLIUM BARK
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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Below is the list of my comments and suggestions for better understanding of our readers. <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I suggest to revise the title. Suggested title is “Antihypertensive and <i>in silico</i> docking of the methanolic bark extract from <i>Syzygium alternifolium</i>”. Upon reading the methodology, there is no isolation and confirmatory procedure done by the researcher for the for the methanolic extract. Extraction of phytoconstituents was done only through methanol distillation, therefore kindly delete the word “isolated”.2. In the section of methodology, 2.1 kindly clarify the statement “pharmacognist discovered this item”. Bark is not being discovered by a pharmacognist, or are you stating that those bark were collected by the pharmacognist?3. In the section of methodology, 2.2 kindly state the method you used in evaporating or concentrating the extract (ex, water bath, oven, air dried, etc)4. In the section of methodology, 2.3 kindly state the method you used in identifying the phytoconstituents present in the extract.5. In the section of methodology, 2.4 kindly substitute the word “effects” to “safety” since acute toxicity testing pertains to the safety of your extract.6. In the section, 2.5 kindly be consistent with the use of rats as your test subject. Mice is different from rats.7. In the section, 2.6.1. kindly state the laboratory equipment you used in measuring the absorbance and its model or serial number.8. In the section, 3 it was indicated results and discussions, however upon reading it only state the results. There’s no discussion with the present and previous studies. Instead, the discussion was written in section 4 as discussion. Kindly clarify these subtitle section.9. In the section 5, conclusion. Kindly revised your statement as most of them are not specific. You stated constituents identified as Quercetin, Kaempferol, Apigenin, Acarbose and Squalene. However, these were not identified as phytoconstituents in the methodology or even isolated. Kindly clarify	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anna Muriel T. Jacinto
Department, University & Country	Industrial Technology Development Institute, Philippines