SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_48032
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis, Characterization and Antimicrobial Activity of Metal Complexes of N-(4-methoxybenzylidene) isonicotinohydrazone Schiff base
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



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 writh his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
	1. Abstract should read "Ni(II), were synthesized by the condensation(p-	
	anisaldehyde), characterized by FTIR"	
	2. Abstract should read "The results indicate that all complexes consist of N	
	and O coordination with metals and haveactivity."	
	3. Keywords. Transition metals should be changed to Cu(ii) and Ni(II) to make it	
	much more direct and specific.	
	4. Introduction. Paragraph 1 should read "opportunities for alteringand	
	making them active against"	
	5. Introduction. Paragraph 3 should read "like antibacterial [9-10],	
	antimycobacterial"	
	6. Introduction. Paragraph 5 should read "R-CO-NH-N=CHR act as" [No	
	verb].	
	7. Introduction. Paragraph 5 should read ""the carbonyl group and hence	
	their ability to coordinate in vivo to the metals."	
	8. Introduction. Paragraph 6 should read "Taking these antecedents into	
	account, this work reported the synthesis"	
	9. Experimental 2.1. The topic should read "General Procedure to synthesize"	
	or "General Procedure for the Synthesis of"	
	10. Experimental 2.1. Paragraph 1 should read "brought to boiling to produce a	
	slurry"	
	11. Experimental 2.1. Paragraph 1 should read "stand overnight and finally a	
	white crystalline solid produced was filtered off and dried."	
	12. Experimental 2.3. Paragraph 4. The sentence "The observedTable 4"	
	should be omitted because it is for results and discussion section and it has	
	already mentioned there (Results and Discussion 3.3. Paragraph 1).	
	13. Results and Discussion 3.2. Paragraph 3. The sentence "The	
	spectrageometry [25-27]." Needs to be rewritten because there is no	
	conjunction and the sentence is hard for the readers to understand.	
	14. Results and Discussion 3.2. Paragraph 4 should read "Conductance), the	
	structure as shown in Figure 2 can be"	
	15. Results and Discussion 3.3. Paragraph 2. What are the criteria for good and	
	moderate antibacterial activity and references involved?	
	16. Results and Discussion 3.3. Paragraph 3 should read "theory [32], the	
	former concerning cell permeability that the lipid membrane surrounding the	
	cell favors the passage of only lipid soluble materials which in turn reflects	
	that their liposolubility is an important factor controlling the antibacterial	
	activity."	
	17. Results and Discussion 3.3. Paragraph 3 should read "may also be the reasons for"	
	18. Conclusions. Paragraph 1 should read "have been investigated by	
	spectroscopy and(all techniques must be clearly specified here)."	
	19. Conclusions. Paragraph 1 should read ""nitrogen to result in a square-	
	planar"	
	20. Conclusions. The only sentence of Paragraph 2 should read "The	
	synthesized complexes are found to be moderately active with respect to the	
	standard against all bacteria experimented and more active than the	
	ligands." All other sentences should be omitted. The other point is that in the	
	text it was shown to be good to moderate activity. So what is the exactly	
	correct conclusion here?	
	21. References. (From random check) No. 3 should be checked again. What does	

Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018) Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

	extra symbol mean? 22. References. (From random check) No. 6 should be checked again for font. 23. References. (From random check) No. 12, 13, 14, 17, 22 and 33 should include the titles. 24. References. (From random check) No. 33 should be no J. 25. References. (From random check) All should be consistent with the full stops (periods), etc.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pipat Chooto
Department, University & Country	Prince of Songkla University, Thailand

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)