



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_25519
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis and Crystal Structure of an Air Stable Primary Phosphine-Manganese (+1) Complex; fac-Tricarbonyl-tris(o-florophenylphosphine)-Manganese(+1)-hexafluorophosphate.
Type of the Article	Short 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) Lack of theoretical instruction in the introduction part, authors are suggested to add more related and recent theories in this part. 2) Lack of discussion. Authors are suggested to add discussion in Part3 Results and Discussion. 3) Some references format is not correct, authors should check carefully. 4) In Fig.2, there is a cubic box to show the structure of the crystal, which should be moved to another place.	Some comments by the reviewer are rather difficult to comprehend. Considering that this is a Short Research Article, some comments follow: 1) The rationale behind the work has already been stated clearly in the introduction. 2) The results have been discussed appropriately in Section 3. 3) The references have been checked. 4) The box referred to is the unit cell outline which is located in the right place.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) authors are suggested to check grammar errors 2) References should be added updated. 3) Conclusions part is not conclusive enough, it is too long as a conclusion.	1) Correct grammar has been confirmed. 2) The references included are relevant and appropriate. 3) The conclusions are consistent with the results.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Not Given	