



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 '**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	Title Novel diazole and dibenthiophenedioide containing tetracyclic systems with promising biological activities Suggested Title: Synthesis and Biological Activities of newly synthesized diazole and dibenthiophenedioide containing tetracyclic systems Abstract - Clearly mention the objective of this study. - Please mention the number of synthesized derivatives - Please mention the biological activities and their significance. - Please mention how IC50 was calculated. - Check grammar. - Abstract is lacking comprehensive significant results and other outcomes. Introduction	Thank you for corrections. The article is about the synthesis of new compounds and not about their biological activity. The mistakes in translation are corrected. The new version of article is edited and presented. Chemicals and solvents used were of analytical grade and did not need any more purification. The spots of TLC were analyzed at layer-chromatography. UV-nanometer is the mistakes. The products were filtered and purified by recrystallization.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	1. Please explain and elaborate introduction and add more updated literature. 2. This part lack the significance of this study. 3. There is a lack of integration between sentences and paragraph. 4. Grammatical mistakes must be removed. Material and methods/Experimental Procedure 1. Which organic solvents were used? 2. Please discuss the synthesis scheme in this section instead to discuss in result section. 3. The spots of TLC were analyzed at which UV-nanometer? 4. Please mention the procedure of purification? 5. Please include FTIR data 6. Proof reading is required Results and Discussion	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	1. Please do not discuss the procedure of preparation of these compounds again here. 2. Biological activities.....how and where are the results of these biological activities 3. Please includes the toxicity profile of these compounds using virtual tools. 4. Discussion is the part of Results, but results were not properly discussed. Conclusion Revision is required. The sentences are almost same as discussed in results section. Avoid repetition. Figures and tables: Figures and tables of biological activities and other results have not been included. For better understanding figures and tables are required.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Proof reading is required to remove grammatical mistakes. Tables and figures are required to support this study.	Grammatical errors corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Need extensive revision before acceptance.	The new version of the article