

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_75644
Title of the Manuscript:	A REVIEW ON THE REPORTED ANTIBACTERIAL ACTIVITY OF 1,3,5-TRIAZINE
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In the page number 3 & 10 the following literature cited has been observed. As per the title given in this review, Author has done literature only for 1,3 5 triazine, not any other molecule , if so, what is the need of giving these 4 molecule literatures in this review? Is there any relation between them? Clarify. Wang et al. (2011) 7-(3-alkoxyimino-4-amino-4-methylpiperidin-1-yl)fluoroquinolones. Manjunath et al. (2012) synthesised quinoline derivatives of Tetrahydrocurcumin. Manikand et al. (2017) synthesised 6-substituted-2-(3-phenoxyphenyl)-4-phenylquinoline. Kamal et al. (2018) synthesised a series of novel sixty three quinoline-3-one.2. Why authors have done review only for antibacterial activity of 1,3,5-Triazine reported? There are N number of activities might have been reported on this same molecule already. If you are publishing review about one molecule leading as drug, you are supposed to do thorough literature survey about what are all the activities carried out & published so far in that respective molecule- Clarify?3. In the Conclusion, paragraph number 13, 14, 15, and 16 has to modify, it is not clear in grammar & the language is not as per journal compliance.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>M. Senthilraja</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>The Tamilnadu Dr. M.G.R. Medical University, India</i>