Dear Dr. Mirela Dragomir,

Thank you for your letter. The paper has been corrected as required by the reviewers.

Thank you for considering publication of our paper.

With best regards,

Dr. Xue

Revisions for reviewer #1

1. In the introduction, the value and purpose of the study should be given in more detail. Despite current literature, there is no explanation for the purpose of the syntheses.

Response: In the introduction, the value and purpose of the study have been given in more detail. An explanation for the purpose of the syntheses is given.

2. The conclusion is also insufficient. The value of the study results is not specified.

Response: The conclusion is improved, and the value of the study results is specified.

3. The elemental analysis values for the synthesis of compound 1 should be reconsidered.

Line 55-56 N 9.85%!

Response: Sorry, it is my typo error, it should be 6.85%.

4. Line 45-46 “ Zinc analysis was carried out by EDTA titration.” Is used. However, there is no such titration in the study.

Response: The EDTA titration is used for the analysis of zinc. The values are given in the elemental analysis parts.

5. Synthesis of the complexes were carried out directly, without the use of ligands. However, antimicrobial activities of the ligands were also evaluated. If these ligands were previously synthesized by the group, the literature could be given in materials method section.

Response: The syntheses of the ligands are given.

Revisions for reviewer #2

1.) A checkcif run of the crystal data deposited shows a series of A, B, C and G level alerts. The authors need to address and resolve these or – at the very least – add meaningful vrf’s for each one. Explanatory notes will be needed to justify the low quality of the data in some aspects (low bond precision, low completeness, etc.). The amended data needs to be deposited again to replace the current one.

Response: The revised cifs have been redeposited to CCDC. All the A and B level alerts are removed.

2.) One of the deposited data sets is associated with a different author name. It appears the data had been deposited earlier with the intent to be published by a different group of researchers. The CSD has urged me to advise the authors to rectify this erroneous deposition to prevent further confusion going forward.

Response: The original deposition was done by my collaborator. He help me to register the CCDC code.

3.) Being of a diamagnetic nature, the compounds can be characterized by multinuclear NMR spectroscopy as well. Given the scope of Acta Chimica Slovenica as a journal for comprehensive research papers I would insist on this to happen prior to publication. While I do understand the limitations with regards to 15N NMR spectra the very minimum should be 1H, 13C and 19F spectra. 2D NMR experiments should be performed to allow for an unambiguous assignment of the very respective proton and carbon resonances to specific atomic positions in the molecules. This would also “put more flesh to the bones” as the amount of characterization techniques applied by the authors is very limited.

Response: The NMR data are given.

4.) The description of the inter- and intramolecular bonding patterns should be enriched by providing graph-set descriptors according to Etter and Bernstein.

Response: The description of the molecular packing is improved.