

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_119598
Title of the Manuscript:	Structural and Potential Biological Properties of SBDTC and SMDTC Containing Metal Complexes: A Brief Review
Type of the Article	

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1- Compounds prepared using the Schiff base method are considered good and effective compounds in the medical field, especially as antioxidants or as antioxidants for a specific line of cancer cells. Yes, the manuscript is important, but it must be developed a lot if possible. 2- When we talk about its structural properties, we must cite detailed methods on how to prepare it, as well as diagnose it well using modern spectroscopic methods. It is preferable to rename in a gentler way. for example (Preparation and study of the biological effectiveness of SBDTC and SMDTC and their complexes derived from Schiff bases.) 3- There is nothing wrong with it, but it is possible to talk a little more about antioxidants and cancer regarding the prepared compounds and which one is more active than the other compared to the reference drug used. 4- It would be good if some sections were added (preparation method with the chart - diagnosing compounds and the type of measurements used with the figures for diagnostic methods, as well as figures and tables and comparing them with the reference drug for antioxidants and cancer). 5- Yes, it's okay. 6- It was good and convenient, but the modernity rate for the last ten years is very low, at 28%.	Respond: 1. The manuscript has been developed that reflected in the revised manuscript. 2. The references have already been cited regarding this issue. 3. Already discussed in the manuscript. 4. There are already some sections in the manuscript. 5. 6. There are many references already been cited in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yas	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	