



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>What is the meaning of metfelhod (fourth line from bottom) ?</p> <p><b>Introduction</b></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><b>Results and discussion</b></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. 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><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>Please simplified your conclusion.</p> <p>Line 190 -191 - The calculated ....in Table 1 and 2. Should be in the results and discussion.</p> <p>Line 195 - 196 - Heat ....Table 10. Should be in the results and discussion.</p> <p><b>References</b></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>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Generally, the manuscript can be accepted after subjected for some major revision before it can be published in a reputable scientific journal.	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anonymous</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Malaysia</b>