Dear Prof. Ivan Oskar Juranic,

We have now revised our manuscript by doing comprehensive review of texts, tables and references. We have highlighted all amendments in the revised manuscript, and we envisage that the overall quality of the paper has improved by a considerable margin.

Hope this revised version meets the high standard set by JSCS. We express our thanks for considering this manuscript for a possible publication in your journal. We shall be looking forward to hearing from you in due course.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| S.No. | Comments from the Reviewer A | Reply from the Author |
| 1. | Magnetic criteria for the determination of the aromaticity are Proton Chemical Shift, Magnetic Susceptibility Anisotropy, Magnetic Susceptibility Exaltation, Helium and Lithium Chemical Shifts, Nucleus Independent Chemical Shift (NICS), Aromatic Ring Current Shielding (ARCS), Magnetizability of π-Electrons, and Current Density Plots. Authors did not mentioned any of them in the Introduction part. | Suggestion incorporated and highlighted in page 2.  The aromaticity indices pertaining to our system has been included in the introduction part (Ref 29-34).  Reliability of NICSzz has been included in the Introduction part. |
| 2. | Several important papers dealing with aromaticity are not cited. See i.e. Boldyrev papers and Tsipis papers. | Remarks attended and highlighted in page 2.  Boldyrev (Ref 29) and Tsipis papers ( Ref 30) related to this research article are cited. |
| 3. | In the introduction, authors summarise the aim of the manuscript with the intriguing questions that the present work intends to address:  • will there be or not a cooperative approach This question is never addressed in the manuscript.  • Would the metals dearomatise ... due to electron partitioning by the competing π acid interactions?  From the fundamental paper that ended the controversy about the aromaticity of η6-benzene-Cr(CO)3 complex complex, ref 45, it is obvious that exercising caution in the quantitative measure of aromaticity for aromatic rings in transition metal complexes is required, and several aromaticity indices are necessary in order to have reliable conclusions. In this manuscript, you utilised only NICSzz and chemical shift. | It has been already incorporated in results at one place. Now the cooperative response has been reiterated effectively in the discussion & conclusion.  Metal cation tends to aromatise the ring of η6-benzene-Cr(CO)3 in contrast to our expectation. This has been clearly emphasised in the corrected version. Highlighted in page 7.  We understand the reviewer's concern, but the aromaticity of η6-benzene-Cr(CO)3 is more controversial and has been debated for about 40 years by adopting various energy-, geometry- and magnetism-based measures of aromaticity. Finally, Sola et al. (Ref 34) analyzed the controversial aromaticity of the benzene ring coordinated to the Cr(CO)3 complex and finally recommended NICSzz as a more reliable index of aromaticity for this particular system. Utilisation of NICSzz has been justified in the introduction part. And it is worth mentioning here that NICSzz seems to be consistently correlating with aromaticity and stability criterion and some of our papers (Ref 28) document the NICSzz's validity in the case of (ƞ6-C6H6)Cr(CO)3. |
| 4. | The FOE abbreviation (which, I guess, stands for frontier orbital energy) is frequently used throughout the manuscript, although it was not defined. | Correction incorporated and Highlighted in page 1, 4, 5 & 9. |
| 5. | Only B3LYP level of theory, with small basis set is used. Also, dispersion is not included (necessary!). The level of theory could influence the result quantitatively. | We completely understand the reviewer’s concern but this is the best that we could produce based on the computing facility available for us.  It is worth mentioning that our results are in par with the trend reported by Sastry et al. (Ref. 46) |
| 6. | Tables VI, V and VI are very cumbersome and they extend over five and a half pages. | Accepted and revised.  Table IV, V & VI has been shifted to the Supplementary Material as SM Table I, II & III. |
| 7. | Some additional abbreviations that are not defined are: RMS, NBO, BSSE… | Correction incorporated and highlighted. |
| 8. | Fig. 1. Has no caption | Caption incorporated and highlighted in page 4. |
| 9. | We strongly suggest to use abbreviations Li+-BC, Na+-BC, K+-BC... instead of M1BC, M2BC, M3BC... because it will be much easier to follow the manuscript. | Accepted and the recommended changes has been carried out and highlighted in page 4,6 & 7. |

Reviewer B

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| S.No. | Comments from the Reviewer A | Reply from the Author |
| 1. | The structure of the manuscript need a revision. There are many data (some of them can be shifted in a SI section) that render the manuscript difficult to read | Accepted and revised.  Table IV, V & VI has been shifted to the Supplementary Material as SM Table I, II & III. |
| 2. | In a table the authors show Mulliken and NBO population. The first can be reported only in a SI section | Accepted.  But we believe that the Mulliken charges presented in Table II are necessary since the discussion part of charge transfer includes it. We hope this will provide a clear outcome for the readers. |
| 3. | The dispersion contribution have been neglected | We completely understand the reviewer’s concern but this is the best that we could produce based on the computing facility available for us.  It is worth mentioning that our results are in par with the trend reported by Sastry et al. (Ref. 46) |
| 4. | Bibliography on the reliability of DFT bases method in cation-pi interaction is not reported. Frontera group hardly work on this subject and their works must be reported. | Accepted and cited the Frontera papers in the introduction part in page 2 (Ref 21). |