

Aging Pathobiology and Therapeutics

Title Full text Author

[Home](#) [About](#) [Guidelines](#) [Current Issue](#) [Archives](#) [Online First](#) [Special Issues](#) [Editorial Board](#) [Videos](#)

[Home](#) > [User](#) > [Reviewer](#) > #650 > **Review Form Response**

Articles Review Form

Guidelines for Reviewers

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for reviewing this paper.

Please bear in mind the tricky balance between making sure that the journal publishes only quality articles and our responsibility to assist authors to write the best paper possible.

It is useful to identify what is valuable in each paper, and to present its weaknesses in terms of what need to be done to improve it.

Title: Is the title adequate for the content, informative, concise, and clear? *

- Excellent
 Good
 Average
 Below Average
 Poor

Abstract: Is it comprehensive by itself? Is the important and essential information of the article included? *

- Excellent
 Good
 Average
 Below Average
 Poor

Keywords: Do the keywords match the subject matter of the article? *

- Excellent
 Good
 Average
 Below Average
 Poor

Bibliography: Is the bibliography used in the article adequate? *

- Excellent
 Good
 Average
 Below Average
 Poor

Figures and Tables: Are the figures and tables used by the author readable and designed with care? *

- Excellent
 Good
 Average
 Below Average
 Poor

Structure and Length: Is the overall structure of the article well organized and well balance the artical written with the minimum length necessary for all relevant information? *

- Excellent
 Good

- Average
 Below Average
 Poor

Logic: Is the article written clearly and correctly? Is it logically consistent? *

- Outstanding
 Good
 Average
 Below Average
 Insufficient

Language: Is the English used in the article readable and good enough to convey the scientific meaning correctly? *

- Yes
 No

Novelty and Originality: Is the article novel and original? Does the article contain material that is new or adds significantly to knowledge already published? *

- Excellent
 Good
 Fair
 Poor

Importance and Impact: Are the presented results of significant importance and impact to advancement in the relevant field of research? Is this article likely to be cited in the future? *

- Excellent
 Good
 Fair
 Poor

Contribution to the field *

- Very significant
 Important
 Modest
 Trivial
 None

Reviewer's Confidential Comments to the authors *

The results in this paper support Apt-H2SD as a valuable senomorphic, offering a general strategy for developing advanced senescence-targeted activatable senomorphics for precise

Reviewer's Confidential Comments to the Editor *

Since the paper lacks the necessary statistical analysis, I suggest the authors should revise the paper.

Recommendation: State the reviewer's opinion on the acceptability of the article by choosing one of the following; *

- Accept Submission
 Revisions Required
 Resubmit for Review
 Decline Submission

Save

Close

* Denotes required field