



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Physical Review & Research International
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012_PRR1_2931
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis, X-ray Crystallographic Studies and Antibacterial Screening of 1-(5-(4-Chlorophenyl)thiazol-2-yl)hydrazine hydrobromide.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript is well documented, but I have big problem with the method they used for antibacterial activity. Agar diffusion method is not so useful. There is no MIC.	The reported method by Okeke et al. is a well-known method used for measurement of antibacterial activity. In this paper, preliminary activity of a single derivative is reported. Keeping in view, the importance of thiazole class, method will be improved or may be changed to evaluate compounds efficacy as well as their MIC.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Authors did not follow the instructions regarding references	All the references have been re-written according to the journal's style.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Even manuscript is well documented I don't think that it could be accepted as original paper. I think that it could be accepted only as short communication.	As we are reporting one compound only, but for further studies it can be accepted as communication. We are happy with the reviewer's decision.