



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_10575
Title of the Manuscript:	(1H-pyrrolo [2,3-b] pyridine)7-Azaindole Derivatives and their antiurease, Phosphodiesterase and beta-glucuronidase Activity
Type of the Article	Original 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The article is novelty and interesting. However, I needs major revision. The title is written partly in capitals, partly small letters – it should be harmonized. Summary is quite incomprehensible without reading the whole article. It lacks the information to search for chemical analogues, for which they can be used, why it is such an important topic. An introduction section is too long. It should be rebuild – the aim of the work should be at the end of this section, the methods of investigation and results should be remove. After introduction it should be the material and methods section. Chapter method is written quite casually, missing parameters methodologies (e.g., in spectrophotometry). It is not possible, on the basis of this description to carry out the same experiment. The methodology information should be remove from the section results. In discussion section there is only a few article cited. This section should be expanded. The form of presentation in the lines 273-379 are illegible, maybe it should be presented in the table? There is any summary/conclusions at the end of that article.	Now the title is written in small letters – it has been harmonized. Summary has the information to search for chemical analogues, for which they can be used, that why it is such an important topic. An introduction section has been shortened. It has been rebuild – the aim of the work has been placed at the end of this section, the methods of investigation and results has been removed. After introduction material and methods section has been written. As per reviewer suggestion Chapter method has been written , The methodology information has been removed from the section results. In discussion section there is now many article cited. This section has been expanded. The form of presentation in the lines 273-379 are legible, can not be presented in table form because these are known compounds and has been reported previously At the end of that article. summary/conclusion has been included.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Typographical errors should be corrected. All of schema should be All diagrams should be signed and numbered. references to tables should be harmonized (now are forms: Table-1, Table 1, Table 1 Table-I). The reference section should be	Typographical errors has been corrected. All of schema has been All diagrams has been signed and numbered. references to tables has been harmonized. The reference section has been corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	corrected.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This article needs major revision. The authors should correct all mistakes and emphasize that their study are important and have a significant impact on the development of science.	All corrections has been done as per reviewer suggestions.