



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_20379
Title of the Manuscript:	QSAR study of Nickel-Schiff base complexes as anti-bacterial agents against Staphylococcus aureus
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	I did not recommend the publication of JAMPS-20379 by your reputed Journal as its Aims, Methodology, Results and Conclusion are similar to JAMPS-20340 (Reviwed by me), only one or two words has been changed. I am mainly concerned with issue of plagiarism. Few different Ni Schiff base complexes and fungal or bacterial strain are not enough to publish the paper. I am attaching both papers highlighted the representative portions with YELLOW colour.	In as much as I appreciate the effort of the reviewer, I want to make it clear that the JAMPS-20340 he/she is referring to was submitted by us and as such, the issue of plagiarism should not arise. The methology, aims, results and conclusion may look similar but a meticulous look at them will prove otherwise. Also, 36 complexes is not too small for QSAR studies as they are many published QSAR work in other reputable journals with lesser data set online. Also, it is not out of a place for a molecule or complex to have the same MIC value for two or more microbes. Cases abound in literature to substantiate this claim.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		