



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_PSIJ_7803
Title of the Manuscript:	Crystal and molecular structure of Di ((E)-2-(pyridine-2-ylmethylene)hydrazinecarboxamide)cobalt(II) dichloride triaqua
Type of the Article	Review 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	<p>This paper reports a routine single crystal structure of a metal complex. The structure appears to be technically correct,</p> <p>Title: trihydrate, not "triaqua"</p> <p>The introduction is far too general and cites some random references that have nothing to do with the title compound. It should focus on related structures, for example the perchlorate salt of the same metal complex. This is not a "new" ligand and several dozen complexes of this species with various metal ions are reported in the Cambridge Database. At least some of these structures should be cited.</p> <p>The chemical scheme is missing a C=N double bond in each ligand.</p> <p>Table 1: state the unit-cell angles.</p> <p>The description of the molecular and supramolecular structures is extremely superficial. Do not pointlessly repeat numerical information from Table 1 (e.g. the cell parameters). Give a proper description of the structure (including supramolecular features) and quantitatively compare it to related structures.</p> <p>The first two sentences of the conclusion state the same thing. The last sentence is RUBBISH – remove it.</p> <p>Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 are very complex and hard to interpret.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Properly typeset the space-group symbol with an "overbar."</p> <p>Show some care and pride(!) in formatting tables and properly displaying special characters!!</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer