

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_123886
Title of the Manuscript:	A brief review on one pot multicomponent synthesis and biological properties of a class of complex heterocyclic compounds
Type of the Article	Review 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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important for the scientific community; it is a good idea for synthesizing new compounds with considerable biological activities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive but many grammatical & punctuation errors were found.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Either cite the images or mention the software along with its version used to draw the structure	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it provides a comprehensive review on multicomponent analysis The authors have critically evaluated the latest advancements. the manuscript employs a multidisciplinary approach, integrating insights from pharmaceutical chemistry	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not set as per the journal's recommendation	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript needs to be revised to make it free from grammatical errors	
Optional/General comments	NA	

Review Form 3

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:	Anurag Sharma
Department, University & Country	Mascot College of Pharmacy, India