

## Review Form2

Book Name:	<b><u>The foundations of coordination chemistry</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_BPR_2523</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The foundations of coordination chemistry</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Complete Book</b>

### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This Book'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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>Yes—this article is important for scientific community.</b>	

[Review Form2](#)

Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	yes-the manuscript is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes- the subsections and structures are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	yes-the manuscript is scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes-the references cross checked and sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes—the quality of the article suitability for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	This can be published	

**PART 2:**

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form2](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>A.V.G.S.Prasad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>JNTU, India</b>