

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_123517
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis and characterization of binuclear complexes of metals transition of N'1,N'4-bis(1-(pyridin-2-yl)ethylidene)succinohydrazide
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Title is ambiguous with no specific purpose/application of the work.• Abstract is lagging in the essence of what the authors are trying to convey in the manuscript.• Introduction doesn't have any sense. Always, introduction should start with the background of the theme, origin of the problem, the research gap and probable solutions the authors are trying to address in the manuscript.• Materials and Methods section is not properly organized. Table 1, Table 2, X-ray structure determination of complex 4 should not be in this section. Furthermore, the structure and general data can be incorporated. Unfortunately, they are in the later part of the manuscript.• Almost all references are included in the introduction. The rest of the content lacks references.• In Results and Discussion section, general study and other subheading are irrelevant under that section.• At most of the places in the manuscript, complex 4 is highlighted, but the reason is not well specified.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N.Thejo Kalyani
Department, University & Country	Laxminarayan Innovation Technological University, India