**Response to Reviewers**

**Reviewer B:**

The authors propose for compound **1** a formula similar to compound **2** (based on: "similarities (color, IR spectra, *μ*eff)". It would have been interesting to compare the powder diffractograms of these two compounds. A good matching (less than 5% of differences) between the two patterns could indicate isostructural structure and be a good starting point for a powder structure resolution based on coumpound **2**.

All compounds are "air-dried" before elemental analyses, however, we observed some small variations between theoretical and practical values. These variations are due to Me2CO or water?

The molar conductivity measurements have also been done with dried compounds? Magnetic susceptibility has been done on air-dried compounds? On crystalline or amorphous powder? Diffractogram of the raw materials would have been a good thing to add to this manuscript. What happens to compounds **3**, which contains free water molecules after air-drying? He is stable in time?

**Response:**

Compounds were air-dried before all analytical procedures, including crystal structure determination. Therefore, they are stable under ambient conditions, with composition as represented by the given formulae. To make this clear, we reformulated beginning of the paragraph under *Analytical methods* section:

*Air-dried compounds were used for all analytical procedures. Elemental analyses (C, H, N, and S) of the compounds were realized by standard micro-methods*.

All compounds are crystalline, not amorphous. For magnetic measurements they are grounded into respective crystalline powders. In the section *Synthesis of the complexes*, it is already stated that compounds are crystalline. Unfortunately, we are unable to perform powder X-ray diffraction experiments due to unavailability of the instrumentation.

We believe that the results of elemental analysis are of sufficient precision and accuracy, and leave no doubt about the chemical composition of the compounds.