

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_115675
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of the global reactivity and characterization of the preferential sites of reactivity of eight (08) derivatives of Tetracyanoquinodimethane (TCNQ) at the theory level B3LYP/6-311G(d,p)
Type of the Article	Review article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. This work is mainly focused on DFT study of eight (08) molecules which is derived from Tetracyanoquinodimethane (TCNQ) and fifth molecule was found to be more oxidizing molecule and second molecule was discussed as less oxidizing molecule. The reactivity study revealed that the nucleophilic concerns the terminal nitrogen atoms and electrophilic attack sites are central ring carbon atoms of analogous TCNQ leads to These dimerization of these molecules.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>Chem-draw structure Quality of the molecules is very low. Change it.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Need to be improved the grammar and sentence making	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Should be given more concentration in the result and discussion part.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	P. Karuppasamy
Department, University & Country	Dayananda Sagar College of Engineering, India