



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_30939
Title of the Manuscript:	Novel diazole and dibenthiophenedioide 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 '**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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. Author is not supposed to use language like "More than one compound in their mixtures are given as medical drugs on market" because most of the compound even looks very good in biological activity but fails in clinical trials due to toxicity and marketing approval comes at a very later stage. 2. Has Author checked the biological activity of synthesized molecules or in vitro study? 3. The Author selectively synthesized compound 8 & 15, how he/she ruled out the formation of isomeric products, as no correlation NMR has shared or may be deoxygenated and freezed molecule NMR and that of the final product(s) likewise. Author is supposed to provide the ref. of related reported compounds and provide data how the synthesized compounds are superior to the existing ones?	1. Thank you for corrections. 2. The mistakes in translation are corrected. Presented facts correspond to biological activity of synthesised compounds. Clearly, not all biologically active compounds are used in pharmacy because of their toxicity. 3. The article is about the synthesis of new compounds and not about their biological activity 4. The most stable isomers are isomers in standard room temperature 5. The new compounds and their synthesis are discussed, but not their biological activity, so it is premature to speak about superiority of new compounds.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Language is very poor, needs to be rectified.	The new version of article is edited and presented
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Nothing is harmonized in article.	The new version of article is edited and presented