



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms: 2012 ACSj 2966
Title of the Manuscript:	Thieno[2,3-d]pyrimidin-4-ones. Part 2. Condensation of 2,3-Disubstituted thieno[2,3-d]pyrimidin-4-ones with Aldehydes.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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	1- The English language & grammar should be revised thoroughly specially in the experimental procedures. 2- The authors should state clearly in the abstract which compounds are new & which aren't. The Known compounds; u state in the experimental part that it was prepared according to reported procedure & then comes the Reference number. 3- When a paragraph or words are used from a reference; write the authors names or et al or --- with the number of reference atop NOT the reference number only (e.g. p 4, line 146). 4- Numbering of the compound should be unified either 1,2 -etc Or α, β -etc specially in NMR interpretation to prevent confusion. 5- In "Introduction" u surveyed the activity of separate entities of yr structures and references from 1-7 written according to these activities and i searched for any sort of pharmacological testing done but nothing!!! so make yr introduction chemistry as possible . 6- Number of references should be increased & if possible the Journal you are aiming to publish in should be cited twice at least. 7- The Schemes should be redrawn in a different & better way with numbers of separate compounds with its substitution	Authors are very grateful to reviewers for useful advice and remarks! 1. Remarks are corrected. 2. In abstract it is particularly specified all new compounds and are specified in corresponding places (and in an experimental part) of article, are resulted corresponding links. 3. Remarks specified in p 4, line 146, and also similar remarks are corrected. 4. Numbering of the compounds and ^1H NMR interpretation are resulted everywhere by 1,2... etc. 5. In introduction corresponding chemical changes, and also in the conclusion results of cytotoxic activity of starting compounds are resulted, according which the article [37] recently has been published. New compounds (2,3, 5a-e-8 a-e, 9), which are synthesized in this work are derivatives of starting compounds 1a,b and 4a-d. Now researches in this direction proceeds. 6. Numbers of references have increased up to 37. 7. According to remarks of the reviewer in all Schemes - 1, 2,3 respective changes are carried out.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	written underneath. 8- In Scheme 3 ; you talked about an intermediate; plz include it between brackets in the scheme. 9- In ¹HNMR: compound 3a, there's "td" is it that apparent in the chart ???(it's repeated in many compounds interpretation), also a "dd" for CH-OH does this mean you got isomers !! if so the chemical name doesn't say so !! Plz send the Data and charts to be included for anyone to see. 10- NO Way the H of OH group to appear as a doublet i think this is a mistake repeated. 11- Where are compounds "2" ? are they known? & where's their data any way? 12- Each procedure to be written with its chemicals used especially when reagents vary & in much better language with correct verbs. 13- Where's the ¹HNMR of compound 9 ??	8. Now the sentence is written particularly. Compound 3 is electrophilic additions product. 9. In our reactions the compounds 2,3,9 are formed as corresponding racemates. In the first version of article it has been missed some typing errors. All remarks (¹HNMR interpretation and the chemical names of substances) are corrected. 10. All remarks (¹HNMR interpretation of the OH group of compounds 2, 3) are corrected. 11. Compounds 2 are known substances. Their data are resulted in the literature [1]. They in the first version of the article have been resulted for comparison. According to the remark of the reviewer, we have changed the Scheme 1. 12. Have changed on recently published article: Olayinka O. Ajani at al., ACSJ, 3 (1), 34-49, 2013. 13. ¹HNMR of compound 9 is resulted in experimental part of the article.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-When authors talk about what they did; talk in the infinitive NOT "we" - Groups in I.R. interpretation should be written normal font not subscript.	Both remarks are corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Mass Spectra fragmentation is no longer required except when there's some exceptional fragmentation that took place. Enough the Mol. Ion peak & the 100% peak with it fragment.	Mass Spectra fragmentation has reduced. Have left the Mol. Ion (M ⁺) peak and the 100 % peak, also most characteristic fragments.