

Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

Point 1:

The overall ms would benefit from close English language proof-reading, and from correcting some errors like page 1 # 36 "than" is written twice, 2 spaces after "showed" page 3 # 83, and so on....

Response 1:

Thank you very much for checking this manuscript carefully. I have been carefully proofread this manuscript again and found many mistakes. All mistakes have been corrected.

Point 2:

A sufficient discussion of the obtained results is still missing. There is no discussion section contrary to the authors' response.

Response 2:

I'm very sorry to trouble you with this issue. The title "Results" should be corrected to " Results and Discussion" . And the discussion part was displayed in the bioactivity assay.

Point 3:

Scheme 1/text: page 4 # 108, the obtained compound is probably A07, and not A02 as mentioned in the text.

Page 4 # 105, when the authors said "Subsequent treatment of the carboxylic acid..." they should specify this treatment is applied to the compound 5.

Response 3:

The mistakes have been corrected. Treatment of the carboxylic acid 5 with o-phenylenediamine was reacted in THF in the presence of HATU, DMAP and DIEPA to yield A01. This method was used to prepare all amide in this manuscript.

Point 4:

Scheme 3/text: page 6 # 128, o-phenylenediamine is not involved in the step which convert 10 to A09 (step b in the scheme), but in the step d (according to scheme 3). The authors should correct this.

Response 4:

This mistake has been corrected.

Point 5:

Table 2 page 8: to help the lecturer, results obtained with compound A12 should be added to the Table 2.

Response 5:

Results obtained with compound A12 has been added to the Table 2.

Thank you for your correction!

Best regards!

Mr Kun, Xing