Dear Dr. Matjaž Kristl,

Thank you for your letter, and your efforts on the review of our manuscript.

The manuscript has been revised in accord with the suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

Heng-Yu Qian

------------------------------------

Reviewer A:

The article could be accepted for publication, after minor revision.

In line 35 »and« between synthesis, characterization In lines 277 and 279 there should be »shows« instead of »show« The conclusion should be extended.

The manuscript could be accepted for publication, after minor revision.

Response:

In line 35 »and« between synthesis, characterization is added. In lines 277 and 279 »shows« are corrected instead of »show«. The conclusion is extended.

------------------------------------------------------

Reviewer F:

- line 9,10: abstract: for uniformity please put the valence for Zn or delete the valence for Co.

Response: The valence for Co is deleted.

- line 23: Keywords: zinc and cobalt complexes not zinc complex and cobalt complex.

Response: Corrected as zinc and cobalt complexes.

- line 51,52: in my opinion you can delete the caution

Response: The caution is deleted.

- pg 2,3: you detailed the synthesis of the complexes 1-4. Please write more in detail the aspects concerning the synthesis of the ligands and of the complexes: write first about the ligands and then about the complexes. You wrote something about this at results and discussion (point 3.1.Chemistry, pg 8,9), complete please at point 2: Experimental.

Response: The synthesis and characterization of the ligand are provided.

-line 237: the the dianionic. You wrote twice: the

Response: the is deleted.

-Antibacterial activity:

- line 273: You wrote: “The two complexes and the free Schiff base were screened for antibacterial activities against three Gram+ and three Gram- bacterial strains”. You have 4 complexes and where are in Table 4 the experimental values obtained for the free Schiff base?

Response: Corrected as: “The complexes were screened for antibacterial activities ...”

- Why did you choose as reference drugs Penicillin and Kanamycin?

Response: Penicillin and Kanamycin are two typical antibacterial drugs.

- line 282: You wrote: “Interestingly, complexes 1 and 2 are excellent agents for B. subtilis and St. faecalis, which even comparable to the effects of Penicillin and Kanamycin”. Even more, the values indicated in Table 4 show that complex 1 is more active on B subtilis and St faecalis than Penicillin and more active on St faecalis than Kanamycin.

Response: Complex 1 is removed due to its new significant findings on catalytic property.

- It would have been useful to determine also the antifungal activity (for example on Candida albicans, Aspergillus niger).

Response: The compounds have no antifungal activity on C. albicans and A. niger.

-pg 17: References: At the reference number 1 (line 307) you have 5 different bibliographical references noted with a),b),c),d),e). Why? If there are 5 different bibliographical references, they should be numbered from 1 to 5. The same observation for the references 2 (line 315), 3 (line 324), 4 (line 332), 10 (line 343), 11 (line 346), 17 (line 359), 18 (line 362), 19 (line 366) and 20 (line 368).

Response: It is the rule of this journal for reference numbers.

-Statement of Novelty: You wrote: “The complexes show effective antibacterial activity”. In my opinion it would be better: The zinc complexes show antibacterial activity on Gram positive bacterial strains.

Response: Statement of Novelty is corrected.