

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	I think this manuscript may have some importance to the medicinal chemistry field as it tried to build a pharmacophore model that can facilitate in-silico screening of a library against enoyl acyl carrier protein reductase (InhA) of Mycobacterium tuberculosis.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title looks suitable but I recommend adding the term "pharmacophore" to the title.	
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.	Authors are advised to better present results and discussion in the abstract. Also, they should state what each abbreviation stands for.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript looks scientifically correct but authors are advised to better describe their methodology. For example, what was the used software for the docking? Also, authors should avoid using the word "simulation" which is entirely different from "modelling". Some of the technical details should be moved from results section into methodology section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I think the number of references is insufficient.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Writing quality may be improved more.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Authors are advised to consider the following: - Writing more details in the introduction about pathophysiology, diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis. - For the keywords, authors should add "tuberculosis" and "Inha".	

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:	Hasanain Abdulhameed Odhar
Department, University & Country	Al-Zahrawi University College, Iraq