



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_51225
Title of the Manuscript:	Microwave-assisted Synthesis, Characterization, Antimicrobial and Antioxidant Activities of 1-Benzyl-3-[(4-methylphenyl)imino]-indolin-2-one and its Co(II) Complex
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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. Page 1. Line 35 should read "Keywords" 2. Page 1. Line 37 should read "Antimicrobial and antioxidant activities" 3. Page 1. Line 38 should read "1. Introduction" 4. Page 1. Line 39 should read "...much attention due to the fact that it speedily.." 5. Page 2. Line 50 should read "...15] hence the need to synthesize..." 6. Page 2. Line 5 should read "...TLC) on Silica..." 7. Page 2. Line 76 should read "(E Merck)" 8. Page 2. Line 78 should read "...a Gallenkamp variable.." 9. Page 2. Line 81. These two steps should be further described clearly. What are they? 10. Page 2. Line 87 should read "...acid with heat." 11. Page 3. Line 113 should read "...methods previously described [17]." 12. Page 3. Line 114 should read "...was used as a control.." 13. Page 3. Line 121, 126 and 127. The authors need to make sure whether they use "mL" or "ml" and make it consistent all over the manuscript. 14. Page 3. Line 125 should read "...8 mm) and sterilized." 15. Page 3. Line 132 should read " After that, the fungal.." 16. Page 3. Line 139 should read "...to allow proper diffusion.." 17. Page 4. Line 164 should read "...according to the literature..." 18. Page 4. Line 179 should read ".....according to the literature [21]. 2.5..." The reference in parenthesis must be omitted. 19. Page 4. Line 180, 181, 182 and 184. Once again, the authors need to make sure whether they use "mL" or "ml" and make it consistent all over the manuscript. 20. Page 5. Line 200 should read "...complex as shown in Table 1." 21. Page 6. Line 213 should read "...in L including the isatin.." 22. Page 6. Line 225 should read "All confirm the.." 23. Page 6. Line 234 should read "...is the characteristic.." 24. Page 6. Line 237 should read "...formula, and revealed the.." 25. Page 6. Line 239 should read "3.4. UV-Visible Spectra" 26. Page 6. Line 240 should read "...compounds are presented in Table 2." 27. Page 7. Line 262 should read "Figure 1 shows the.." 28. Page 7. Line 263 should read "...as a bar chart. The compound was only.." 29. Page 7. Line 276 should read "...as a bar chart." 30. Page 7. Line 280 should read "...against it" 31. Page 8. Line 289 should read "...electron. The compounds under study are not..." 32. Page 8. Line 290 should read "...either form dimers or attack.." 33. Page 8. Line 292 should read "...molecules or when they form chelates. The cobalt(ii) complex.." 34. Page 10. Figure 5. The legend for bar graph should read "Ascorbic acid" 35. Page 10. Line 325 should read "NO· radical.." 36. Page 10. Line 326 should read "NO· radical is readily.." 37. Page 11. Line 370 should read "...genotoxic which encourages involving research for further investigations." 38. Page 11. Line 386 should read "Appl Organomet Chem" to be consistent with other references. 	The corrections have been effected.



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	