

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

Amal El-feky<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> pharmacognosy, National Research Centre, Cairo, Egypt

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. In the topic, replace *Melilotus indicus* by *Melilotus indicus* L. in the topic and in the whole manuscript, and write (*In vitro*) in italic form.
2. Abstract: The Abstract must be restructured. Its current version lacks depth. Additionally, the Keywords fail to encompass the essential terms.
3. Introduction: The introduction requires a more comprehensive background regarding the existing gap in the literature on shortages, as well as a clear illustration of the study's novelty. It is essential to enhance this section with relevant and well-researched information.
4. Materials and methods 2.1: State the position of Dr. Ula Almousawii, who identified the plant, the voucher number, and the time of collection.
5. The extract underwent insufficient phytochemical screening, which hindered the characterization of its primary phytoconstituents. Additionally, there was an absence of total phenolic content determination. Furthermore, analyses such as HPLC or LC/MS, which are essential for identifying the predominant flavonoidal compounds in the extract, were not conducted.
6. Antioxidant assay: It is essential to employ multiple assays in the antioxidant evaluation process, as relying solely on the DPPH assay is insufficient to accurately assess the activity. Where is the table that depicts the correlation between concentration and the percentage of inhibition?
7. Docking study: On what basis did you choose these flavonoids for your study?
8. Finally, my recommendation is MAJOR REVISION.