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1. The English need improvement since there are some grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript. For example, • in line number 47, the words “Predictive” may be as “The predictive”; • in line number 58, “apoptosis” as “the apoptosis”; • in line number 74 and 661, “takes a” as “plays a”; • in line number 111, “In TCM” as “In the TCM”; • in line number 115, “Research” as “The research”; • in line number 134, “Network” as “The network”; • in line number 148, “innovative” as “an innovative”; • in line number 190, “Gene” as “the Gene”; • in line number 298-299, “with appropriate” as “at an appropriate”; • in line number 335, “coix” as “the coix”; • in line number 343, “from PC” as “from the PC”; • in line number 394, “as Figure 4 showed” as “in Figure 4”; • in line number 414, “an Herbal” as “a Herbal”; • in line number 467, “human” as “the human”; • in line number 503, “dealt” as “that dealt”; • in line number 549, “in cell” as “in the cell”; • in line number 604, “PPI” as “the PPI”; • in line number 619, “a intense” as “an intense”; • in line number 655, “expression” as “the expression”; • in line number 671, “target” as “a target”; • in
line number 681, “growth” as “the growth”; • in line number 695, “of treating” as “for treating”; • in line number 698, “foundation to” as “foundation for”. The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text. For example, • in line number 22, the words “widely-utilized” may be as “widely utilized”; • in line number 53, “an increase” as “an increased”; • in line number 131, “exhibit a” as “exhibits a”; • in line number 139, “to simulate” as “to simulating”; • in line number 233, “abcam” as “Abcam”; • in line number 254, “Low Temperature” as “Low-Temperature”; • in line number 333-334, “drug likeness” as “drug-likeness”; • in line number 387, “process” as “processes”; • in line number 516, “Acacetin induced” as “Acacetin-induced”; • in line number 678, “proved” as “proven”. The typos not mentioned here are also to be checked and corrected properly. 3. Check the abbreviations throughout the manuscript and introduce the abbreviation when the full word appears the first time in the abstract (The use of abbreviations in the abstract section may distract readers who wish to quickly skim through several publications before deciding to read one in full. It may therefore help to write out terms fully in this section, for example, CCK8) and the remaining for the text and then use only the abbreviation (For example, colorectal cancer (CRC), etc.,). Make a word abbreviated in the article that is repeated at least three times in the text, not all words to be abbreviated. The plant name should be italic all over the manuscript. 5. The introduction part appears less informative about “colorectal cancer” thus this section should be indicated as detailed to understand the manuscript in clear since the main objectives is focused on colorectal cancer with recent references. 6. In introduction, the authors may cite recent fatality rate or prevalence or incidence data “colorectal cancer” and it should be in either 2023 or 2024 since the authors cited only up to 2021. 7. In the materials and methods, the authors may cite references for standard protocol, manufacture instructions, if reference
is given with it and the same should be added in the reference section. 8. When referring to SPSS versions beginning from 19, authors should cite ‘IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, version 25 (IBM Corp., Armonk, N.Y., USA)’ and similarly for GraphPad Prism 10.0. 9. The figure legends should be improved and a proper footnote should be given. All legends should have enough description for a reader to understand the figure without having to refer back to the main text of the manuscript. For example, the necessary abbreviations should be given which are used in the present investigation. 10. The authors may also be included the limitation of the present results for a better understanding of the manuscript.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. In the title the following words should be given properly since the authors have used both upper and lower case of letters. For example, “molecular dOcking” as “Molecular docking”; “In vITRO vAlidation” as “In vitro validation”; 2. The authors have given abstract in other language and it should be changed in standard English language. 3. There are some grammatical, alignments and typographical errors noted in the manuscript and it should be thoroughly checked and corrected throughout the manuscript. For example, the words “in intestines” may be as “in the intestines”; “duplicates removed” as “duplicates were removed”; “P