



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_22227
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and Estimation of an in Silico Model for Anti-HIV-1 Integrase Inhibitor Using Genetic Function Approximation
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1- Sentences which are between 54 and 76 rows should be rewritten because there are many similarity between literature and this part (<i>Mohsen Dolatabadi at all Prediction of antibacterial activity of pleuromutilin derivatives by genetic algorithm-multiple linear regression (GA-MLR)</i>, <i>Monatshefte für Chemie</i> 2010, 141, 5, pp 577-588 and <i>Jignesh Mungalpara at all. Molecular modelling and QSAR analysis of some structurally diverse N-type calcium channel blockers</i>, <i>Journal of Molecular Modeling</i>, 2010, 16, 4, pp 629-644) Ethical Issue: There isn't any ethical issue	The manuscript has been revised. The sentences between line 54 and 76 has been rewritten as pointed out by the reviewer,
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1- Line 93 and Line 94 should be combined. 2. Structures of the molecules in Table 1 should be drawn more smoothly. Some numbers were written on the shape of the molecules. Please see Fig C and Fig D. 3. If the compound hasn't functional group, there is no need to write functional group in the table. Please see Fig C and Fig D, there isn't R3. 4. Line 122, "Descriptors were calculated using the Spartan" if written, "Descriptors were calculated by using the Spartan" it will be beter 5. Table 5 should be rearranged more smoothly	The manuscript has been revised. The line 93 and line 94 have been adjusted in accordance with the journal format as pointed out by the reviewer. 2. Corrected 3. Corrected 4. Corrected 5. Corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	6. Line 224 written “ in table 4” if written, “ in Table 4” it will be beter 7. Line 327 written “GFA-MLR model are listed in (Table 5)”, if written, “GFA-MLR model are listed in Table 5” it will be beter 8. Line 387 written “The aim of the present work was developing a QSAR study and predicting the anti-HIV” if written, “The aim of the present work was to develop a QSAR study and to predict the anti-HIV” it will be beter 9. Writing of the references should be rearranged in a single form: see line 400 ref 2, line 412 ref 6 and line 459 ref 21	6. Corrected 7. Corrected 8. Corrected 9. Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		