

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_96302
Title of the Manuscript:	Testing of Electrical Properties and Synthesis of Mno2-Graphene Composites from Leaching Results of Manganese Rocks
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal'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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalajacr.com/index.php/AJACR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Yes, it is relevant.</li><li>2. Suggestion: Testing of Electrical Properties and Synthesis of Mno2-Graphene</li><li>3. Reasonably yes.</li><li>4. The idea is correct but there are flaws in the structure and lack of explanation of results.</li><li>5. Citation errors that do not appear in the References and vice versa must be corrected.</li></ol> <p>The article needs a major review of structure, writing form (errors of punctuation, units and others), there is a need to deepen the explanation of results, there are significant errors in citations and references.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Need to improve	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rodrigo Sanhotene Silva
Department, University & Country	State University of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil