

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_81510
Title of the Manuscript:	THEORETICAL STUDY OF THE CHEMICAL REACTIVITY OF A SERIES OF 2,3-DIHYDRO-1H-PERIMIDINE.
Type of the Article	Review Article

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:

(<https://www.journalirpac.com/index.php/IRJPAC/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In the introduction, the authors list several potential uses of perimidines in a variety of areas. No references are provided that highlight these uses. Recommend that references be cited for each of these.2. Throughout the results and discussion, the authors provide a very minimal discussion of the significance of the results. (a) What is the benchmark for known molecules that would allow the reader to compare the molecules investigated in the paper. Are there cases where related computations for drugs with similar architectures, as an example, that can be compared to those in this paper that would give the reader an idea of enhanced efficacy? If so, adding those to the discussion would make this work stronger and highlight the importance of studying the perimidine class of compounds.3. Where is this work headed? In the conclusion, the authors do not discuss, for example, molecular docking studies, which would be a logical follow-on to these computations.	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The paper has a number of grammatical and sentence structure issues that must be corrected. I have highlighted those in the manuscript with recommended edits.2. The structures in Table 1 appear "squeezed". Recommend reformatting so that they do not have that appearance.3. The references cited, for a paper of this length, are not a sufficient survey of the current literature, in my opinion. There should be additional papers cited that address the type of computations performed in this work.	
Optional/General comments	This paper does have merit and with some revisions, would be suitable for publication.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph C. Sloop
Department, University & Country	Georgia Gwinnett College, USA