

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_101358
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of curcumin method in determination of boron in steel and Usage of natural curcumin in the analysis
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.journalajocs.com/index.php/AJOCS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is not important for the scientific community, the testing is not clear.</p> <p>Title is too long and not effective</p> <p>The abstract should be reduced and the introduction is very long in abstract.</p> <p>It can be improved</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The references are not sufficient, lack of latest references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language should be improved</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Title needs improvement Keywords should be minimum five written in alphabetic order Introduction is very limited, references are very less. Literature review is missing Elaborate caption of figures 2.1 it should be written in tabular form and explain it Results and discussion should be explained more with previous literature. Conclusion is very limited and should be written in bullet form. References are not written properly References should be increased. Needs improvement in formatting</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beenish Jehan Khan
Department, University & Country	CECOS University of IT and Emerging Sciences, Pakistan