



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_40462
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of 6-311G(d) and 3-21G(DFT/HF) Methods of 3-Methyl-4-[3-(3-methoxybenzoxy)-benzylidenamino]-4,5-dihydro-1H-1,2,4-triazol-5-one
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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <p>What is the meaning of metfelhod (fourth line from bottom) ?</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>Line 16 - 17 - Many properties.....experiment. Should be supported by references.</p> <p>Line 17 - 18 - In fact,method. Should be supported by references.</p> <p>Results and discussion</p> <p>The results are well represented, but there is a lack of discussion. For example, data from Table 1-3, no discussion has been made on bond angles, bond lengths, Mulliken atomic charges.</p> <p>Is there any different of data between all the method used.</p> <p>Figures 3, 4 and 5 showed data collected in this research, but no discussion has been made to that data.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Please simplified your conclusion.</p> <p>Line 190 -191 - The calculatedin Table 1 and 2. Should be in the results and discussion.</p> <p>Line 195 - 196 - HeatTable 10. Should be in the results and discussion.</p> <p>References</p> <p>Please standardised format of writing references.</p> <p>List of references showed that 50 % of the references are in the year below 2007.</p> <p>I suggested that the author cite an article that up-to-date. (year 2007 -2018 about 70%)</p>	<p>Abstract</p> <p>It is a lapse of pen</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>I updated and added the last references</p> <p>Results and discussion</p> <p>all the results were evaluated and compared.</p> <p>In discussion section, I made evaluations.</p> <p>References</p> <p>I added up-to-date references</p>
Optional/General comments	Generally, the manuscript can be accepted after subjected for some major revision before it can be published in a reputable scientific journal	