

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Chemical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_128051
Title of the Manuscript:	QSAR studies for the design of new arylamide-derived inhibitors of Mycobacterium Tuberculosis enoyl acyl carrier protein reductase (Inha)
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research is indeed apt because of the deaths caused by Tuberculosis worldwide. The need to discover more potent drug(s) for combating Tuberculosis cannot be over-emphasized.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No QSAR and Molecular Docking Studies for the Design of Novel Arylamide-Derived Inhibitors of <i>Mycobacterium Tuberculosis</i> .	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract did not emphasize on the results of the research and citation should not be found in abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is scientific.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The referencing should follow the Journal guideline as there is no uniformity in the listing.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, good English.	
Optional/General comments	The authors did not include ligand, 41-1-14 in Tables 3,7 and 10. 2D diagrams did not show the type of bonding interaction between the ligands and amino-acid residues of the protease.	

#### 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>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dayo Felix Latona
Department, University & Country	Osun State University, Nigeria