



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_34259
Title of the Manuscript:	Simple Synthesis of Sulfonyl Amidine-Containing Glucosidase Inhibitors by a Chemoselective Coupling Reaction Between D-Gluconothiolactam and Sulfonyl Azides
Type of the Article	Short Research 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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In this paper, a simple synthetic approach of gluconoamidinylsulfones has been developed by coupling of D-gluconothiolactam and sulfonyl azides . And gluconoamidinylsulfone 1 exhibits a better inhibition on alpha and beta glucosidases than a known inhibitor, 1-deoxynojirimycin. However, I have following questions or suggestions for authors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1> In materials section, it is better to show the company information of reagents. 2> Line 119, the sentence is not clear. 3> The K_i values of 1-deoxynojirimycin are better to be added in Table 1. 4> Gluconoamidinylsulfones 1 and 2 show different inhibition on alpha and beta glucosidases. If authors can further analyse the interactions between inhibitors and glucosidases by molecular docking. It will make this paper stronger. 	<p>As indicated in the following response, we have taken all the comments and suggestions into account in the revised version of our paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We agree with the reviewer's comment, thus clearly show the company information in the materials section (lines 68, 69, and 72 in the revised manuscript). 2. We agree with the reviewer's comment, thus correct the sentence (lines 125-126 in the revised manuscript). 3. According to the suggestion by the reviewer, we add the K_i values of 1-deoxynojirimycin in Table 1. 4. We appreciate the reviewer's constructive comments, and the simulation data are just what we desire. However, unfortunately, we cannot conduct docking simulation immediately because we have no system for the calculation and we are unfamiliar with the simulation. Now, we are planning to introduce the system or



SDI Review Form 1.6

		collaborate with theoretical researchers. Therefore, we would like to show the docking data in a next full paper with additional numbers of potential inhibitors, not in this communication-type short article.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		