SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJOCS_42832**
Title of the Manuscript:	**QSAR STUDY ON THIOSEMICARBAZONE DERIVATIVES AS RIBONUCLEOTIDE REDUCTASE INHIBITORS**
Type of the Article	**Review Paper**

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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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	**Reasons:** **1. Few Examples:** **a. The very first statement of abstract shows the ignorance towards language.** **b. The whole abstract is inappropriate .This continues in the whole paper.** **2. The author(s) has/have don't have understanding of QSAR methodology** **a. The second statement of abstract tells about the 21 compounds taken and then performing QSAR on them whereas only 13 comps. Exhibited activity, thus making the whole paper incorrect . It appears that ignorant about the descriptor to number of compounds ratio required for performing QSAR (The most BASIC Requirement).**	NOTED
Optional/General comments		