

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_105067
Title of the Manuscript:	Pharmaceutical Significance Of Oxotungsten And Oxochromium Complexes Of Schiff's Bases Derived From Thiosemicarbazones
Type of the 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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community, considering the obtaining of new chemical compounds with pharmacological potential.</p> <p>2. Pharmaceutical importance is not discussed in the manuscript, so the title is not appropriate. Suggestion: "Synthesis of Oxotungsten and Oxochromium Complexes of Schiff's Bases Derived from Thiosemicarbazones and its antimicrobial activity"</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive, but it seems incomplete, as it does not present results regarding the antimicrobial evaluation.</p> <p>4. The structure is not adequate. The introduction is extremely deficient, not presenting a review with recent references, both in relation to obtaining the compounds and their originality or not, as well as their pharmaceutical importance. The results of the antimicrobial evaluation were not discussed. There is no conclusion.</p> <p>5. More analyzes of the products obtained are necessary for an unequivocal characterization. Antimicrobial evaluation is poor, with few examples and no comparison with reference compounds. Therefore the manuscript is scientifically deficient.</p> <p>7. The references are old, and most of the time, about the methods or techniques of analysis, and not referring to the compounds obtained or the results of the antimicrobial evaluation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English is acceptable, with some typographical errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Considering the scope of the journal, it seems that the manuscript does not fit the profile suitable for publication.</p>	

[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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Helmoz Roseniaim Appelt
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal do Pampa, Brazil