



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_ACSj_18204
Title of the Manuscript:	Electronic effect of substituents present on carbonyl compounds: Analysis of product formation in one-pot synthesis of 1, 3, 4-thiadiazole ring
Type of the Article	Short Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The Abstract section – From my point of view, the abstract could contain information how many new original compounds have been prepared.</p> <p>The Keywords – They should be modified, for example, in such manner: 1,3,4-thiadiazoles – multicomponent reaction – electronic effects</p> <p>The Experimental section – <u>For all the equipment, material and chemical used, (brand), company and country should be provided in an uniform manner.</u> Furthermore, if authors have carried out elemental analysis, the elemental analyser apparatus should be listed. <i>Minor corrections which should be done:</i> mol not mole; in Scheme 1, the substituents for the compound 2a–2m should be listed, not only for the series 1; <u>from the content of Experimental section, it has not been clear how many new original compound have been synthesized and spectrally characterized;</u> in the section 2.4 (p. 4, lines 106-107), other reference should be used</p> <p>The Results and Discussion section – in Results and Discussion section, more physical constants of the compounds prepared previously should be provided (including appropriate references; p. 5, line 128) or it could be included within Experimental section with corresponding references.</p> <p>The Conclusion section – More specific information about current research should be definitely provided.</p> <p>The References section – Provide, please, volume, issue (optional) for all references. In addition, unify, please, the indication/non-indication of the issues for cited papers.</p>	<p>Necessary inputs and corrections were incorporated as suggested.</p> <p>Physical constants of all the compounds are listed in table.1 and literature values and reference of reported compounds are also given as table 1 foot note.</p> <p>We have highlighted the one pot methodology and electronic effect of the compounds and few of these compounds are synthesised by two step methodology eg.ref 8.</p> <p>Conclusion is revised as per comments.</p> <p>References are corrected in revised manuscript.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<u>Please, all references used should be checked and properly revised.</u>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In entire manuscript, slight improvement in the language should be provided.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		