

Review of: "Forecasting of the influence of physical fields on the metabolic nanocurrent in proteins"

Muzamal Hussian¹

¹ Government College University, Faisalabad

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In the paper, authors present“ Forecasting of the influence of physical fields on the metabolic nanocurrent in proteins”.

Various examples are given. The current work has some weakness and vague grammatical mistakes and lack of enough literature support are significant concerns. English of the entire manuscript needs to be improved for clarity and cohesiveness. However, in my opinion this paper needs minor revision. Detailed comments and questions are provided below:

Issue1:

Some new references about research subject should be added entirely in the reference list and cited adequately in the text such as following. As it stands, the goal of this review is not evident, and I suggest that it is better organized.

1. Effects of elastic medium on buckling of microtubules due to bending and torsion. Advances in Concrete Construction, An International Journal.
2. The effects of the surrounding viscoelastic media on the buckling behavior of single microfilament within the cell: A mechanical model. Advances in Concrete Construction, An International Journal
3. Analysis of nonlocal Kelvin's model for embedded microtubules: Via viscoelastic medium Smart Structures and System.,
4. Discretization and bifurcation analysis of tumor immune interaction in fractional form.
5. Instability analysis of microfilaments with and without surface effects using Euler theory
6. Effects of elastic medium on the electric potential of neural tissue by using spherical bidomain
7. Mechanics of anisotropic muscles embedded in viscoelastic medium”

Issue 4:

The visualization of the graphs is not in well manner which is not readable?

Issue 5:

Why do you only provide analysis for measuring cell viability? I guess, it is probably because of the limitation of your modeling. If not, I recommend developing it also for the other boundary conditions.

Issue 6:

There are many sentences with no reference. There is a need for referencing from "reliable" and "fundamental" papers or textbooks. The Conclusions section should be improved. The main contributions and outcome of the article should be highlighted.

Issue 8:

I suggest to authors that present more explain about the algorithm. I think this is a point the author(s) should mention and discuss. The technique is described too quickly, and a reference to an internal report is not sufficient for a reader.

Issue9:

The language, sentence formation and grammar of the entire manuscript need to be improved for clarity and cohesiveness. It is better to check the English by a native speaker.

Issue 10:

Please compare the results with above said references for the validation of paper.