

Review Form of JCMO

<http://www.ijmo.org/>

Paper ID : CQ5003

Paper Title : Pharmacophore Modeling of N1-alkyltheobromine as Histamine-H1 Receptor Antagonist

I. REVIEW

A. Suitability of topic

1. Is the topic appropriate for publication in IJMO?
 Yes Perhaps No
2. Is the topic important to colleagues working in the field?
 Yes Perhaps No

B. Contents

1. Is the paper technically sound? If no, why not?
 Yes No
2. Is the coverage of the topic sufficiently comprehensive and balanced?
 Yes
 Important Information is missing or superficially treated.
 Treatment somewhat unbalanced, but not seriously so.
 Certain parts significantly overstressed.
3. How would you describe the technical depth of the paper?
 Superficial
 Suitable for the non-specialist
 Appropriate for the generally knowledgeable individual working in the field
 Suitable only for an expert
4. How would you rate the technical novelty of the paper?
 Novel Somewhat Novel Not Novel

C. Presentation

1. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?
 Satisfactory Could be improved Poor
2. Are the title and abstract satisfactory?
 Yes No
3. Is the length of the paper appropriate? If not, recommend how the length of the paper should be amended, including a possible target length for the final manuscript
 Yes No
4. Are symbols, terms, and concepts adequately defined?

Yes Not always No

5. How do you rate the English usage?

Satisfactory Needs improvement Poor

6. How do you rate the list of references?

Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

D. Overall rating (circle appropriate rating)

1. How would you rate the technical contents of the paper?

Excellent Good Fair Poor

2. How would you rate the novelty of the paper?

Highly Novel Sufficiently Novel Slightly Novel Not Novel

3. How would you rate the "literary" presentation of the paper?

Totally Accessible Mostly Accessible Partially Accessible Inaccessible

4. How would you rate the appropriateness of this paper for publication in IJMO?

Excellent Match Good Match Weak Match Poor Match

II. RECOMMENDATION

- Publish unaltered
- Publish In Minor, Required Changes
- Review Again After Major Changes
- Reject (Paper Is Not Of Sufficient Quality Or Novelty To Be Published In This Journal)
- Reject (A Major Rewrite Is Required; Encourage Resubmission)
- Reject (Paper Is Seriously Flawed; Do Not Encourage Resubmission.)

III. COMMENTS

Please state the reason you gave the recommendation above. Please give the author specific guidance regarding revisions, differentiating between optional and mandatory changes.

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The paper presents very preliminary level work of on-going research.2. Equations need to be typed using editors.3. Result and analysis needs improvisation. |
|--|

