



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_50401
Title of the Manuscript:	INVITRO BIOCHEMICAL STUDIES ON ORGANOMETALLIC COMPOUNDS AS ANTICANCER AGENTS
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>)

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	<p>There are no any information or data about the complexes except only two IR spectra. The authors should give some physicochemical and spectroscopic data about the complexes. If they did not get the physicochemical and spectroscopic data or information, they should do/make analyses. And some comments should be done about the data of the complexes.</p> <p>In addition, only complex IR spectra are meaningless: they should be given with the ligand's IR spectra by comparing.</p> <p>There is a deficiency in the suggested structures of the complexes in Scheme 1: One of copper(II) ions coordinated to the N and S atoms without dehydrogenation, so it needs some ions for providing the electroneutrality. These ion(s) were not shown on the Scheme.</p> <p>In addition, the authors emphasize that the ligands and the complexes are new or not. They also give some literature information, if the ligands and the complexes were studied before. If there are studies in literature the authors should cite these studies.</p>	Many thanks for reviewing efforts and valuable comments, almost the requested corrections were fulfilled.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>It will be better If Scheme 1 are given as horizontal (now it is vertical). Conclusion is very short. It should be given as more detailed.</p> <p>In the study, anticancer activity of the complexes 3a and 3b, however the authors showed additional two complexes in Scheme 1, 2a and 2b. So, the scheme should be revised.</p> <p>Some paragraph disorders and misspelled words should be revised. For example: swiss → Swiss. Page 9: "thiosami carbazne", "followe", "derivaties"</p>	The misspelled words were corrected.
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	