



№3 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>)



№3 SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	There are some missing points to understand this paper: @ How is it new or superior than Ref.[9]? @ How does the QMO calculation relate to Figure 1? @ No explanation for Figs.2-3 and Table 2-3 in the text. @ Six lines in Fig.1, but only three cases are shown in Table 1. @ Is the solvent effect considered in that calculation? @ What is the Russian letters in the result section?	Everything was corrected. According to Figure 1 the first model of papaverine was constructed? Then was done the quantum chemical calculation, from which was defined the maximum charge on the hydrogen's atom In the text of manuscript were carried the discussions of figures and tables. In table one was shown three chances for both concentrations 0.5 mg/100 ml и 2.0 mg /100 ml, so on the spectrum of Figure there are six lines The Influence of solvent in the calculations were not taken into consideration. Calculation was done in gaseous phase. Thank you. Everything was corrected.