



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_45211
Title of the Manuscript:	Impacts of Analogy and Dimerization of Bioactive Compounds on Molecular Biological Functions.
Type of the Article	Original 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	The Keywords should not be more than five (5) that is: analogy, dimerization, resveratrol, isorhapontigenin and piceatannol.	Noted and corrected.
Minor REVISION comments	Introduction: toward the end of the introduction, it is important to capture the need and important of the current research topic to the scientific world. Material and Methods: the materials which include the chemicals and equipments used in the research should carry the BATCH, PRODUCT NUMBERS and SYSTEMIX MODELS each. The chemicals and the equipments should be well separated. Results and Discussions: the results and Discussions should be well separated.	The importance has been revised. The material used are personal/dedicated computer with software's and servers which have been mentioned in the methods. No handling of chemicals. Results are now in separate section from discussion.
Optional/General comments	The abstract was well structured since it captured the aim, methodology, result, discussion and conclusion. The manuscript is well written but the author(s) should take note of the compulsory and minor revision comments. The manuscript was also well referenced and the citations where well cited. The manuscript was also well concluded.	Noted.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> YES, there is need for ethical. The author(s) need to provide ethical approval for carrying out this research. All experiments need to approve by the appropriate ethical committee before the experiment is carried out especially where there is need to used animal or human subjects.	This study did not involve the use of animal or human in the lab. It is a computational study that make use of existing curated raw biological information to predict the set of model compounds, which possible represented what could be encounter during drug discovery process.