



№5 SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACSJ_22405
Title of the Manuscript:	Papaverin. Geometrical and Electronic Structure. Acidic Force.
Type of the Article	Original Research Papers

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>)



№5 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	Research and output does not make sense. It is made in a hurry. English is poor. In the abstract: Its acid 9 strength ($pK_a = 30$ for AB INITIO/6-311G** and $pK_a = 30$ for DFT-PBE0/6-311 G**) has been theoretically evaluated. While the numbers are different in the text and conclusions. Even though numbers do not add up to common experimental sense. The authors say: We have established that the molecule of hexoprenaline relates to the class of very weak acids ($pK_a > 14$). This is obviously from another research!! The molecule is different! Calculations (bond lengths and angles etc..) are tedious and not to publish. The only figure and its corresponding table are not needed for the comparison. Therefore the article is empty.	English we have improved The abstract we had improved. The significance of pK_a we had corrected Our article was devoted only to papaverine. Use of the word hexoprenalin is the misprint. Tables 2 and 3 brought into the proof, that the calculation was done correctly by both methods and summary charge on the atoms in both chances are in accordance with the law of preservation of charge.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Ethical Issues; Yes in a way. Molecule name different in abstract.	Mistake in the abstract was corrected.