

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_130272
Title of the Manuscript:	Rauwolfia serpentina Phytochemicals as Orexin Receptor-2 Agonists for Narcolepsy Management
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript throws important light on Orexin Receptor-2 and Narcolepsy. It is important for understanding the potential of the <i>Rauwolfia serpentina</i> ; a plant many scientist around the world are not aware of. Good work!	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is fairly good.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Line 1 – 7 and half of line 8 is not necessary in an abstract; they belong in the literature. An abstract is usually a summary of the research; aim(s), method, results, conclusion and suggestion(s). Please, be specific about the plant in the keywords; <i>Rauwolfia</i> is just a generic name, and does not indicate species.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. It followed the acceptable guideline for <i>in silico</i> research process. Note: be sure to check if et al. should be italicized.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The reference is fairly sufficient, but appropriate citation is needed in subheading 2.4 and 2.10 of the methods. Also, add the source of figure 1 and table 1.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is very suitable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In the INTRODUCTION, check line 4 and arrange. From the definition of Orexin should be a new paragraph; you had established its introduction in the previous paragraph. Be consistent with spelling (serpentina or serpentine = second paragraph; line 4). Check spacing in line 13 of paragraph 2.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ndinyelum Miracle Onyebuchi
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria