

Review of: "Evaluation of Antioxidant Activity and α -Amylase Inhibitory Potential of *Melilotus indicus* Ethanolic Extract: An In Vitro and In Silico Study"

Cletus Anes Ukwubile¹

¹ University of Maiduguri, Nigeria

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. In the topic, put the authority of the plant. Change ethanolic to ethanol.
2. Abstract: Structure as Background, Objective of study, Methods, Results, and Conclusion. In the concluding part of the Abstract, please change this statement to reflect the major findings and possible recommendations for further study:
These findings suggest that *M. indicus* may be a valuable source of natural antioxidants with potential health benefits.
3. The Abstract needs to be rewritten because major findings from the study are lacking. The Abstract is too shallow in its current form. The Keywords do not capture the necessary words.
4. Introduction: This aspect also lacks many vital pieces of information on the topic of research. The author failed to address the major gap and novelty of the present study. The introduction must be expanded with well-informed literature.
5. 2.1: State the voucher number of the plant. Write all grams as g. What do you mean by until completely dried? How many weeks or days was the plant shade-dried? The photos of the plant must be original photos from the habitat of the plant, not from the internet. Use the photos obtained from the field as snapped by the author.
6. 2.4.1: Write all ml as mL.
7. For antioxidant activity, you should use at least two assay examples, such as DPPH, ABTS, NO, FRAP, H₂O₂, for proper validation. Using only the DPPH assay is not enough to derive meaningful conclusions.
8. Statistical analysis was poorly done. For comparison within groups and between groups, it is better to use one-way ANOVA, not a T-test.
9. 2.5.1: The author did not isolate and test any of these compounds listed for antioxidant activities before docking analysis. What informed your choice of these compounds?
10. 3.2: Results and Discussion should be merged, not separated as the authors have done. However, if it was Results before Discussion, the current form is okay. Write the unit of total phenolics as mg GAE/100 g dry weight and total flavonoid as mg QE/100 g dry weight.
11. The Results and Discussion section needs MAJOR REVISION for the paper to be accepted for publication.
12. Finally, my recommendation is MAJOR REVISION.