SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJOCS_52715**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Copper (II) Complex of Salicylaldehyde Semicarbazone: Synthesis, Characterization and Antibacterial Activity**
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)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	1. Line 10, no paragraph in abstract. 2. Line 11, keywords should arranged in alphabetically. 3. Space texts with brackets. 4. Join line 152 with 153. 5. Line 208 correct the unit in yellow. 6. Line 217 correct the unit in yellow. 7. Line 294 the word "**biological**" should be "**biologically**" 8. Your reference is faulty. List all the authors do not use et al this is only accepted in text not under reference. 9. Date in bracket comes immediately after the list of authors, .e.g. should like: Mohindru, A., Fisher J.M., and Rabinovitz M., (1983). *Bathocuproine sulphonate: a tissue culture-compatible indicator of copper-mediated toxicity.* Nature, **303**(5912): p. 64-65. Not like: Mohindru, A., J.M. Fisher, and M. Rabinovitz, *Bathocuproine sulphonate: a tissue culture-compatible indicator of copper-mediated toxicity.* Nature, 1983. **303**(5912): p. 64-65	**Sincerely, the authors are highly appreciative to the reviewer for giving his/her immeasurable effort to review the manuscript. The precious comments, suggestions and corrections are immensely appreciated to improve the quality of the manuscript. The opinions and suggestions have been incorporated in the revised manuscript.** **1. Authors sincerely agree with the reviewer's comment and have modified the abstract in a single para as highlighted in the revised manuscript.** **2. Now, keywords have been arranged in alphabetically.** **3. Now, authors have done this throughout the manuscript.** **4. Those two lines have joined in the revised manuscript.** **5. The unit has been corrected now.** **6. The unit has been corrected now.** **7. The word has been corrected in the revised manuscript.** **8. References have been modified now.** **9. It has been done in the revised manuscript.**
Optional/General comments	Good	

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)*	**Authors have ethical approval to draw their own conclusions about the results presented in the paper.**