SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_67802**
Title of the Manuscript:	**CONFORMATIONAL EPITOPE PREDICTION OF BIRCH BETV 1 AND HAZEL COR A1 TOWARDS B-CELLS**
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	This manuscript employs computational tools to identify and characterise hot spot residues involved in the interactions between two antibodies and selected allergens, for immunotherapeutic applications. The work has some degree of novelty as few such studies in the area of allergic immunoreactions exist. Overall, I found the paper to be relatively well written and articulated. However, if the paper is to be accepted, the comments made on the manuscript and that follow below should be thoughtfully addressed. It occurs to me that there is significantly missing data which makes the work seem incomplete and keeps one wondering if there is sufficient evidence to arrive at the conclusions made by the authors. To fill this gap, the following data and analyses should be made and reported. 1. Clearly docking calculations where performed. However, results are not well and comprehensively reported. The authors should tabulate the following values obtained during the docking. Binding Energy, Root Mean Square Deviations and docking scores for each selected antibody-antigen docked pose. 2. What methods were used to validate the docking – computational or experimental? Atleast one of these must be used as this work is merely a prediction and needs to be assessed further if obtained results have real life significance. I suggest results obtained from Molecular Dynamic Simulation work should be added as validation.	
Minor REVISION comments	The authors should proof read the manuscript in detail to correct tenses used. Please, see sentences highlighted in "YELLOW" which I believe should be written using the past tenses.	
Optional/General comments	Authors should do well to cite the software applications used.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Nebangwa Derrick***
Department, University & Country	***King's College London, UK***