

----- Original Message -----

From: **XXX YYY** <xxx@yyy.zzz>

Date: Sat, Jun 9, 2012 at 1:33 PM

Subject: Re: Request for Final Decision for revised manuscript: 2011/IRJPAC/1370

To: Managing Editor

As per this particular paper, I do have a sort of "mixed feelings".

You see, even though both Reviewers demanded a Minor revision (I could agree with that), some of their criticisms were NOT answered by the Authors AT ALL. In these cases, the Authors simply noted that they would take into account these critical remarks further, in their "subsequent work". But the bottom line of EVERY serious review is to encourage the Authors to change their manuscript NOW - just in order to make it fitting the aim & scope of the Journal. Am I right ???

So what do we see here ???

On one hand, the Authors declares that they AGREE with certain Reviewers' critique points, but on another hand - simultaneously - they're merely IGNORES these peculiar criticisms in a revised version of their work.

Looks rather strange to me... Isn't it ?

Taking into account our clear indexing intent and understanding an obviously incomplete (at least) nature of this paper, I would firmly insist on either

(1) an exact and clear following (by the Authors) to ALL criticisms stated by Reviewers with a following evaluation of the resulting paper version by CE or by AE,

OR

(2) ...a rejection of the paper (which is actually far of looking perfect anyway).

Hope you'll find a correct way to share this my opinion with the Authors. Sorry for being unable to look nice for everyone.

Editor's Details:

Dmitry A. Kuznetsov

Department of Medicinal Nanobiotechnologies, N. I. Pirogoff Russian State Medical University, Russia

And

N. N. Semenov Institute for Chemical Physics, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide the email id.