

Review of: "Expansion of the antifungal activities through in silico docking study of compounds from Albizia lebbeck fruits"

Peter John¹

¹ National University of Science and Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This manuscript focuses on a very interesting research topic, which is the anti-fungal potential of *Albizia lebbeck* fruits. It involves the virtual screening of its bioactive compounds using a bio-computational software for their anti-microbial effect against *C. albicans* and in vitro anti-microbial assays for several microbes.

Here are a few comments that need to be addressed by the authors:

Abstract

1. The structure of the abstract can be modified to introduce the potential of *Albizia* with its anti-fungal properties to formulate a background and then move onto the mention of its constituent bioactive compounds to highlight the objective of this study.

Introduction

1. Full form of *C. albicans* ought to be written at first mention.
2. The connection between steroidal biosynthesis and *C. albicans* can be further elaborated upon.
3. Even in this section, the background on *Albizia* is missing; this could be elaborated upon to emphasize why it was selected for this study.
4. Consistency in referring to nomenclature must be exercised, i.e., *Candida albicans* at first mention and then either *Candida albicans* or *C. albicans* to be used and not interchangeably.

Materials and Methods

1. The links to each of the software utilized may be embedded within the text.

Results and Discussion

1. The reason for only lebbeckisoetin A (2) and chiakine (7) being experimentally assayed for their antimicrobial activities against five microbial strains could be further elaborated upon and linked with the in silico results, as mentioned at the start of this section.
2. The legend of figure 1 is missing; this could be incorporated.

3. There is repetition of text within the introduction and this section; this could be avoided by paraphrasing.
4. What do the docking scores of i.e., -7.9 to -3.5 represent? This could be discussed further to provide clarity for the reader.

Overall, this manuscript has potential and can be further improved by addressing these points before publication. Also, there are grammatical errors that can be fixed to enhance understanding of the manuscript.