

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_85522
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis, Characterization and Biological Activity of New Amides Containing Azo Moieties
Type of the Article	Organic

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:

(<https://www.journalajacr.com/index.php/AJACR/editorial-policy>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In abstract, change can be to was. In section 2.1, delete all the mentioned locations. As long as the compounds 4,5 and 7 were prepared previously, the sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 are deleted, and it can refer to them in phrase without mentioned the location. So the section 2.2.3 becomes 2.2.1. No need to repeat Table 1, instead, after last one can refer that all the properties of all compounds are recorded in Table 1. In section 2.3.2, the weight arranges in respective to 0.07 g, 0.20 g, 0.21 g and 0.27 g, the changes follow this arrangement. In section 3, the first 11 lines are mentioned previously, no need to repeated here. The FTIR and UV spectra should be incorporated in the text. The Schemes 3 and 4 can be unified in one Scheme. The attribution of electronic transition are not correct because the energy proportional inversely with wavelength. Why the spectra are missing. The author(s) should explain the mass peaks by fragmentation the compound and returns each fragment to its origin in spectrum, at that time I decide the compound is actually was prepared. The microbiology activity should be supported with microphotos. Conclusion is a second copy for abstract. Change the year of reference 9 to 2000. 	<p>We would like to thank the reviewers for their efforts to read the manuscript and give comments and recommendations.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Done. Done. Done. Done. Also, the titles of all the tables are corrected. Done. Done and this paragraph is corrected. Done. Done. The chart of UV is added. The table of UV is deleted. Done. Since, all our previously published researches showed the results of biological activities in a table, we thought that was enough. We did not give any consideration to the pictures. By the way, this valuable comment will be taken in the future. We changed the abstract. Done. <p>Thank you for all notes.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	