

**Review Form 1.7**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry</b>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_IRJPAC_116100</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Coordination of N,O-donor appended Schiff base ligand N,N'-bis(3-methoxy salicylideneimino-1,3-diaminopropane) towards Nickel (II), Copper (II) and Zinc (II) :<br/>Syntheses, crystal structure</b> |
| Type of the Article      |   |

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>The manuscript may lack significance for the scientific community, it solely focuses on the synthesis of a metal complex without exploring further applications or implications.</p> <p>Consider for refining the title.<br/>My suggestion<br/>"Synthesis and Characterization of Nickel(II), Copper(II), and Zinc(II) Complexes with N,O-Donor Schiff Base Ligand N,N'-Bis(3-Methoxy Salicylideneimino-1,3-Diaminopropane): X-Ray Crystallographic Analysis of the Nickel(II) Complex"</p> <p>The abstract does not appear to be comprehensive as it does not cover all the results of the study. It would be beneficial to include a broader overview of the results to provide readers with a more complete understanding of the research findings.</p> <p>The manuscript lacks proper structure and execution, which may hinder its clarity and coherence. I recommend referring to standards set by reputable journals for guidance on improving the organization and execution of the manuscript.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.<br/>Yes</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>English quality of the article require improvement to be suitable for scholarly communications</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crystallographic studies indicate no evidence for the coordination of the nitrate molecule. However, based on IR and Figure 4, it is evident that the N(II) complex is coordinated with the nitrate molecule. This inconsistency is highly controversial and requires a thorough explanation.</li> <li>The absence of elemental analysis data and explanation in the section is concerning, especially considering that the abstract mentions the inclusion of elemental analysis in the characterization. It is essential to address this discrepancy and provide the necessary data and explanation in the Results &amp; Discussion section .</li> <li>There is a lack of explanation regarding the NMR spectra, which is crucial for understanding the molecular structure and interactions. Incorporating an analysis of the NMR spectra would enhance the comprehensiveness of the discussion.</li> <li>The execution of the explanation of results and discussion lacks clarity and coherence. It is important to improve the organization and coherence of the section to enhance readability and professionalism.</li> </ol> |   |

## Review Form 1.7

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>5. Grammar errors should be addressed to improve the overall readability and professionalism of the manuscript. Ensure that the language used is clear, concise, and appropriate for a scientific publication.</li><li>6. Utilize software like ChemDraw for drawing structures to enhance visual clarity and professionalism.</li><li>7. Verify figure and table citations for accuracy and consistency.</li><li>8. Verify the references citations too.</li><li>9. Address any grammar errors to improve the overall readability and professionalism of the manuscript.</li></ol> |  |
|--|---|--|

### **PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

### **Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                  |
|----------------------------------|------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Bencela M</b> |
| Department, University & Country | <b>India</b>     |