



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	2012_ACSj_2966
Title of the Manuscript:	Thieno[2,3- <i>d</i>]pyrimidin-1 4-ones. Part 2.* Condensation of 2,3-Disubstituted thieno[2,3- <i>d</i>]pyrimidin-4-ones with Aldehydes

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
I'd like to say that the manuscript definitely improved but still there are some corrections to do: 1- I really felt in a conflict; did the authors do the ant proliferative testing or not, u wrote in Conclusion: the new compounds showed weak activity (HeLa) & more consistent inhibition in P3X?? Then you wrote researches in this direction proceeds & also written in comment 5. Which do i believe? Plz state whether u did or not with the most active new compound number written in abstract & conclusion. Add the procedure & table of results even if for someof the new compounds to the manuscript & try to get a SAR written in Discussion. 2- In Synthesis of compounds 2 & 3: the reaction mixture was boiled under reflux or just heated in boiling W.B. for 0.5-4 hrs or what?? Then write "the desired compounds were obtained in moderate yields" because u already wrote the yield in exptal data. 3- In 1H-NMR of 2 & 3 u forgot to write the hydrogen of the OH group when u did the corrections required. Plz add them. 4- Where r the elemental analysis, Molecular formula, mass spectrum (for 2 of the series at least) or did u do "high resolution MS" also write the results. 5- No need to write all IR or NMR bands in the "Discussion" the characterstic one is enough. 6- No need to write yield % in discussion or experimental procedure, already written in experimental data of each compound. 7- The reference u sent in reply to comment 12 is inconsistent to yr work; it talk about syn of diethylamides of sulphonamides" ?? 8- These r some corrections of language used: "move forward depending" instead of (goes in) in abstract. "This work was carried out---" instead of (These researches are carried out---) in introduction 4th line from down up. "---4d were synthesized according to method described by Elmuradov et al" instead of (were synthesized using a method as described in literature [1] in 2.2.Synthesis. "was heated at 78°C in water bath" instead of (was boiled in water bath during) in 2.2.1. General procedure for preparation of 2 & 3. We don't say (dropped out ppt) but rather "the separated ppt was filtered or the solid precipitated or the precipitate formed was collected" use whatever in every procedure. "compared to" instead of (as against of) in conclusion. "—azepine ring; attempts failed even with heating --" instead of azepine ring reaction does not go even at --) in conclusion. 9- What do u mean by "Together with it" in 2nd paragraph of conclusion. Plz rephrase taking into consideration all my remarks. 10- Range in 1H-NMR of compound 9 to be corrected (written 2.93-1.90 for m, 9H) 11- You haven't put any reference of this journal; hope you did Not find.	Authors are grateful reviewers for useful advices! All changes are resulted in yellow color. 1 - Biological activity of the synthesized new compounds (2,3,5-8a-e,9) is studied. It is necessary to emphasize, that they are derivatives of starting substances (1 a,b, 4a-d). Cytotoxic activity of starting compounds is in detail investigated in the reference [39]. Therefore, we think, that among the synthesized compounds (new) it is possible finds potentially biologically active preparations. 2 - In Synthesis of compounds 2 & 3: Reaction mixture was boiled in water bath at 85-90°C for 0.5-4 h. 3 - In 1H-NMR of 2 & 3 the chemical shifts of the hydrogen of OH group was added. 4 - The elemental analysis results, Molecular formula of the compounds (2,3,9) were added. 5 - IR and 1H NMR spectral results have reduced in the "Discussion". We result only shared data for discussion of structures of the synthesized compounds. These values unequivocally confirms, that reactions proceed exclusively on 8- / or 9-methylene groups. 6. Such remarks (yield % in discussion or experimental procedure) everywhere are corrected. 7. This reference has been used only as a sample for preparation our manuscript. 8. The remarks which are specified in abstract, introduction, 2.2. Synthesis, 2.2.1. General procedure for preparation of 2 & 3, in conclusion are corrected. Changes are resulted in yellow color. 9. All grammatical mistakes are refined. 10. Chemical shift in the 1H-NMR spectrum of compound 9 is corrected (2.93-2.90 ppm; 1H, m; 9-H). 11. – We put two references [33] and [34] from ACSj. [33]: Am Chem Sci J. 2011; 1(2): 37-49. [34]: Am Chem Sci J. 2012; 2(3): 86-99.



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

I'd just like to tell u : make all authors put 2-3 references from yr journal in his/her manuscript if available this helps citation & people know yr journal more

Authors are grateful reviewer for useful advice!

We put two references [33] and [34] from ACSj.

33. Jain D, Rani A. MgO enriched coal fly ash as highly active heterogeneous base catalyst for Claisen-Schmidt condensation reaction. Am Chem Sci J. 2011; 1(2): 37-49.
34. Hegazy WH, Gaafar AE.-DM. Synthesis, characterization and antibacterial activities of new Pd(II) and Pt(IV) complexes of some unsymmetrical tetradentate Schiff bases. Am Chem Sci J. 2012; 2(3): 86-99.