



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_44594
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis, anticancer and molecular docking studies of 1-(5-substituted phenyl) isoxazol-3-yl)-5-phenyl-1H-tetrazoles
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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	<p>The chemistry part is almost copy pasted from the earlier publication, i.e. Kaushik et al., J Adv Sci Res, 2015, 6(1): 14-19. Though this paper is cited but not mentioned clearly that chemistry part is same as published earlier. In any case the chemistry part should be deleted from the submitted manuscript. The corresponding reference is enough.</p> <p>I have checked and found that the spectral data of compound 4a-4j do not match completely with that already published earlier. Please clarify.</p> <p>Table 1: the data of reference compound is missing. In absence of this it is not only difficult to assess how good these compounds are but also to figure out if the assay is working. Similarly the docking results of reference compound are missing.</p>	<p>We put this material only for the easiness of the reader, reader can read the material related to chemistry, docking study and biological activity of compounds in one paper, if you have any objection regarding this than we will removed it and references will be provided for that part.</p> <p>It happened by mistake, Corrected.</p> <p>We compared the same compound on different cancer cell lines to compare the growth percentage by that the growth inhibition will be more for less growth percentage of cell line. By this study we can conclude that compound is having high anticancer activity for which type of cell line.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Title: remove the word "synthesis" because it is already published earlier</p> <p>Abstract: remove "synthesized by Huisgen cycloaddition of benzonitrile and sodium azide followed by acetylation then Aldol condensation reaction with aromatic aldehyde and further Michael addition reaction between nucleophile and α, β- unsaturated compound. Structures of synthesized compounds were characterized by MS, IR, ¹H-NMR and elemental analysis".</p> <p>Conclusion: revise "1-(5-substituted phenyl) isoxazol-3-yl)-5-phenyl-1H-tetrazole have been synthesized and characterized" by removing "synthesized and characterized" part.</p> <p>Some of the sentences need revision to avoid plagiarism because of earlier paper J Adv Sci Res, 2015, 6(1): 14-19.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Modified</p> <p>Revised</p>
Optional/General comments	The anticancer activity and docking study of the synthesized compounds appeared to be new, rest are known.	Discussed in the Compulsory comments