

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_109159
Title of the Manuscript:	Topological Indices of Antibiotic Drugs used in Pneumonia treatment with their QSPR analysis and M-polynomial
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. This manuscript proposed degree-based topological indices for pneumonia drugs. Comparing with all regression models, it is observed that H index is high predicting value with the properties MW by cubic regression model. Over all, the cubic regression model shows the best predictive ability when looking at the maximum R<sup>2</sup> value. It also derived the M-polynomial of these drugs. All of these present that the manuscript is somehow important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. The tile is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Hard to tell whether the conclusion is correct or not since it puzzles me why the cubic regression model carries out the best result rather than others. It will be very beneficial if the author could explain it further.</p> <p>6. Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Not very enough.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ke-Ming Shen</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>East China University of Technology, China</b>