



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_30939
Title of the Manuscript:	Novel diazole and dibenthiophenenedioxide containing tetracyclic systems with promising biological activities
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 '**l a c k o f N o v e l t y**', 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1-Rewrite the manuscript again in using a standard chemistry literature rules. I advise that authors study the ACS guide before writing. 2- The article is full of typos, syntax, style and basic language mistakes. 3- The author(s) stated that the research is concerned by screening of their compounds as antibacterial. No mention of any antibacterial test in Results or Experimental section	1. The manuscript is re-edited according to the given advices 2. The typos, syntax and language mistakes are corrected. 3. The article focuses only on the synthesis of new compounds. The article contains only an idea that synthesized compounds might have some biological activity
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- IUPAC names are all faulty - Experiment title should change to Experimental - What is "recovery" reaction? - Bullets in writing should be removed	The corrections have been taken into account. Under "recovery" reaction is meant the transform of nitro-compound to amino-compound



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Writing the experimental of each compound and spectra should change - Use of most of terminology are wrong such as spectrometer, spectroscopy ^1H NMR, etc. Basically, I count no one single line all over the manuscript without mistakes.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- The presented chemistry is very primitive to be any research work in chemistry. The work is more of technical training work than a research work. - The tetracyclic fused aromatic will likely have great toxicity against human cells because polyarmatic systems intercalate to DNA	