

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_88605
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis, Characterization and Biological Evaluation N-[5-(1H-indol-3-yl)-1,3,4-thiadiazol-2-yl]methanimine Derivatives
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:

(<https://www.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/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	The article has an original idea, yet has serious flaws: -first of all, it requires major revision of the English language; -the drafting needs correction, as it contains major errors; -the abbreviations (FTIR, HNMR, CNMR, DPPH) should be explained the first time they appear in the text; -the Introduction section does not provide sufficient information to describe the present state of knowledge; -what was the aim of the study? It is not formulated; -in the section "Materials and methods" the authors should specify the provenance of the materials used in the study (producer, batch no etc.); besides, the analysis methods are not described in detail; -in the beginning of the section "Results and Discussion", the paragraph from the "Materials and methods" section is repeated; the results are presented without being accompanied by a description of them, so it is very difficult for the reader to understand their meaning; -in subchapter 3.1, entitled "Spectral data", only data are presented, with no explanation; subchapter 3.2 is entitled "in vitro antioxidant screening", but refers to the data presented in subchapter 3.1; - there is practically no "Discussions" section, there are no references to other specialized studies; - the authors state at the end of the article that the 3d compound is more effective, but there is no statistical analysis in the study to prove this; -the References are old. More new references should be added, as they are available in the literature; - reference 17 is not referred to anywhere in the text.	Modified as suggestion
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	