



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	In the Abstract 1- In line (12-13) the authors reported as highlighted in the manuscript : Urease Inhibitory potential for Standard Thiourea (IC₅₀=21.00). However compound 8 (IC₅₀= 133.3) & Compound 10 (IC₅₀=125.1) exhibited activities close to the standard. Comment: This is not logical at all the gap between standard IC₅₀=21.00 uM and Cpd 8 & 10 is not close at all, the authors need to revise this section.. 2- Likewise in line (15) The authors reported Compound 8 showed good Beta-glucuronidase Inhibitory activity (IC₅₀ = 192.6) while the standard (IC₅₀= 48.4). Comment: By merely looking at the values compound 8 is not good at all so the authors have to be very careful in writing about the values, I mean this is the main part of the paper if it is not written well how about the rest of the paper	1-The sentence urease Inhibitory potential for Standard Thiourea (IC₅₀=21.00). However compound 8 (IC₅₀= 133.3) & Compound 10 (IC₅₀=125.1) exhibited activities close to the standard has been changed to exhibited moderate urease potential. 2-The sentence, compound 8 showed good Beta-glucuronidase Inhibitory activity (IC₅₀ = 192.6) while the standard (IC₅₀= 48.4). has been changed to Compound 8 was found to be beta-glucuronidase inhibitor with IC₅₀ 192.6 ± 3.53 μM
Minor REVISION comments	In the Introduction 1- There are some repeating sentences in the conclusion part for example: In Line (84-86) authors reported: we now wish to report the investigation for B-glucuronidase inhibition as well as other enzyme inhibition including urease and phosphodiesterase of some new derivatives.	1-In the introduction the line we now wish to report the investigation for B-glucuronidase inhibition as well as other enzyme inhibition including urease and phosphodiesterase of some new derivatives has been eliminated. 2-The introduction has been shortened and summarized and unnecessary stuffs



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In Line (98-100) reported: We report in this paper the synthesis and <i>B</i>-glucuronidase inhibition as well as urease and phosphodiesterase inhibitory properties of the 7-aza indole compounds and their mechanism of inhibition. Comment: This should be corrected as is boring to read the repetitive things... 2- Generally speaking the introduction is little bit long if the authors can summarize and avoid writing unnecessary stuffs, likewise there are some grammatical errors and spelling errors which need to be addressed as well e.g: In Line (110) Reported: The compounds herein described were synthesised as a part Comment: synthesized not synthesised, and should be corrected throughout the manuscript	has been eliminated, some grammatical errors and spelling errors has been corrected : The word synthesised, has been corrected to synthesized throughout the manuscript
Optional/General comments	There are some negligence in writhing the most important part of the paper which include the interpretation of the result and if corrected the article can be a piece of contribution in the field of science In the Chemistry, it is well written but it will be much nicer if the authors can put at least some spectrums of proton-NMR or Mass spect in the supplementary or in the manuscript to support the data.	Interpretation of the result <u>has been included in the text</u> <u>These are known compounds reference has been given in the manuscript</u>