

# Review of: "Expansion of the Experimental Antifungal Activities Through in Silico Docking Study of Compounds From Albizia Lebbeck"

Sajjad Hussain Sumrra<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Gujrat

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

## **[Review Report for Qeios]**

The manuscript entitled "Expansion of the Experimental Antifungal Activities Through in Silico Docking Study of Compounds From Albizia Lebbeck" is very poorly written, and the ideas do not flow logically. The manuscript, in my view, is in a preliminary state and is inadequate for publication in its current form in the *Qeios*. This manuscript continues to be rather poor in scientific and English writing. It lacks the desired level of scientific merit. I would encourage the authors to carry out a series of additional experimental work and submit it at a later, more advanced state. Some of my serious concerns are given below:

1. Why do the authors mention 'extension of experimental antifungal activities' in the title if only one fungal strain and four bacterial strains are used for the antimicrobial assay?
2. Why did the authors choose *Albizia lebbeck*? The second species' name (*lebbeck*) will always be lowercase even if it is in the title name.
3. Revise the abstract; it should summarize the main results of the work and not read like the introduction and conclusion.
4. The introduction part of the manuscript is not appealing and must be revised. Cite the following papers for molecular docking simulation studies:
  - <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molstruc.2022.134780>
  - <https://doi.org/10.1080/07391102.2023.2293260>
  - <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10534-022-00385-6>
5. The manuscript needs reorganization and should be re-structured and complemented with more computational/experimental information. Not all the results are properly discussed. Include more discussion of the results rather than simply tabulating the results.
6. The authors should also include the statistical analysis for the obtained results.
7. Rearrange the structures of the docked compounds of Figure 1. At least shift compound 14 to the end and compound

4 before compound 7.

8. The data is not represented in a well-structured and presentable manner. The text of the manuscript must be properly aligned and formatted. Subheadings 2.3 and 2.6 are missing, and 2.7 is at the end after heading 3. Also, add subheadings in section 3 'Results and Discussion'. There are many space issues as well. The authors need to recheck the manuscript carefully.

9. Ensure consistent style, font style, and size for all structures, figures, and tables.

10. The conclusion section needs improvement. Rewrite it and make it meaningful.