



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_18954
Title of the Manuscript:	Design of COX-1 Inhibitors Utilizing Class I Isosteres, Class II Isosteres, and Nonclassical Bioisosteres for Substituent Substitution on Proved Parent Structures
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	Line 199, the authors say that the compound 18 improved in term of drug likeness (e.g zero violations of rule of 5), but according to the table 1, it did not improve. However, according to the same table, compound 21 did improve in terms of drug likeness. Please modify this.	This has been clarified in lines 199 to 202. The author means that 1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 19, 20, and 21 have ZERO violations of Rule of 5. While the parent compound meclofenamic acid HAS ONE VIOLATION OF RULE OF 5.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Regarding the violation of the rule of five from meclofenamic and tolfenamic derivatives, the authors mention how many violations were committed but do not specify which rule was violated. This discrimination would improve the article. C oncerning the chemical structures, they should be numbered for a better understanding.	The type of violation for Rule of 5 for Table 1 is given on lines 209 to 211. The type of violatin for Rule of 5 for Table 2 is given on lines 386 to 387. The RULE OF 5 parameters are listed in lines 158 to 163. Readers can easily determine what parameter is in violation by referring to that section. Numbering of the aromatic rings varied immensely based on the structure which WOULD CAUSE GREAT CONFUSION AND NOT ADD TO THE OBJECTICE-WHICH IS TO SHOW DRUG-LIKENESS AND



SDI Review Form 1.6

		COMPARISON TO THE PARENT COMPOUNDS. Numbering the aromatic rings position would not contribute to demonstrating the drug-likeness of the isosteres or nonclassical bioisosteres.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general, the manuscript is well written, which describes the use of statistical tools in order to find new drug candidates based on fenamates as parent compounds to inhibit COX-1 enzyme. Although it does not demonstrate any novelty, the manuscript is robust and has important technical data. Therefore, it may be published after the revision mentioned above.	Thank you very much for comment.