



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>)



[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 write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 1. Line 11 should read "...compounds was tested against..." 2. Page 1. Line 11 should read "...Cereus, showing higher antibacterial activity than the ligand." 3. Page 1. Line 26, left column, should read "...described below in Scheme 1." 4. Page 1. Line 27, left column, should read "...extensive investigations." 5. Page 1. The chemical formulas in Line 16 and 17 (right column) should read H₂sb as in the abbreviation in Line 15, right column. 6. Page 1. Line 17, right column, should read "...shows antitumour activity [8]." 7. Page 1. Line 22, right column, should read "...exceed a number of previous active compounds including those..." 8. Page 2. Line 1. There is no detail about the instrument for conductivity measurement. 9. Page 2. Right column. Line 5 from the bottom should read "...orange product which was filetered.." 10. Page 3. Left column. Line 8 from the bottom should read "...acetic acid)." 11. Page 3. Left column. Line 7. Agreement with what? Calculations? 12. Page 3. Right column. Line 8 from the bottom should read "...plates and then the plates were filled..." 13. Page 4. Table 1. How to figure out the FW? 14. Page 5. Left column. Line 5. Mononuclear from what evidence? 15. Page 5. Left column. Ratio 1:1 from what evidence? Elemental analysis? 16. Page 5. Left column. Line 7. Be specific for the proposed structure. Is it square planar? How to know? 17. Page 5. Left column. Line 10. How does the BM indicate the proposed structure? 18. Page 5. Left column. Line 13 should read "...ligand acts as a tridentate one [19-22]." 19. Page 8. Left column. Line 3. "Bacillus Cereus" and "Enterbacter Aerogenes" should be italicized. 20. Page 8. Right column. Line 5. The main reason for the activity should be mentioned a bit, not just referred to the previous article. 21. Page 9. Left column. Line 7-10 from the bottom. There is no discussion about this in the main text. 22. Page 9. Left column. Fine-tuning. How fine and in what aspects? 23. Page 9. Right column. Line 4 from the bottom. You have done the systematic investigation or not? Or you just propose and encourage others to do further investigations? Be specific and clear. 24. Page 10. Ref. 12. Should the name of the journal be all capitalized? 25. Page 11. Ref. 18. Should the name of the journal be all capitalized? 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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