

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_83534
Title of the Manuscript:	Linear optical absorptions of photo/thermochromic organic molecules interacting with a gold nanoparticle
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>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>i) Figure 3 and table 1, extremely poor data representation and discussions on the correlation of these two. The figure shows ϵ (with no mention anywhere what it is) and oscillation strength (without unit). In table 1, ϵ is missing and a new parameter “f” is introduced without acknowledging in the text. Figure 3 shows three major peaks at ~360, ~275 and ~190 nm; however discussions are made only for the peak obtained at ~360 nm. While the peaks at ~360 nm and ~190 nm shown increase in intensity for 3.18 A° compared to other two (i.e., 4.18 and 5.18 A°); the peak at ~275 nm shows reverse trend of decrease in intensity as compared to other two. Author has not made any efforts to clarify this discrepancy. Table 1, the wavelength (λ) continuously decreases in the order of excitation no. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, why?? No discussions in text on that. Page 7, last line “... Are increased by 7,4 and 230%....(see Table 1).”; no data compiled in table in terms of %, then what author is referring for. ii) <u>The same errors mentioned above in sr no. (i) are repeated throughout the manuscript</u>; see discussions made on figure 4 & 5 and table 1; figure 7,8& 9 and Table 2; figure 11, 12&13 and Table 3. A complete revision of the manuscript is necessary as pointed in sr no. (i) for discussions related with all figures and tables. All figures and tables also need to be updated for a visible correlation. iii) Page 1, line 2 references 1-17; author has not made any effort to discuss/to understand what these researchers wish to communicate; giving large number of references without their short description is not a good practice. iv) Page 3 lines 2 and line 9 (last line), references (1-20); same problem as mentioned in sr no. (iii) v) Page 4, line 5, references 21-33; same problem as mentioned in sr no. (iii) vi) Page 4, line 7, references 34,34-39,39; correction is needed. vii) Page 5, line 6, “...cis-VHF og s-trans-VHF..” what og stands for? viii) Page 5, line 19, “.....as displayed in Fig. 2-10.”; Check the word Fig 2-10, not correct. ix) Page 19-20, Conclusion, references 52 and 53; conclusion is to summarize the outcome of the current study of the authors, not to discuss previous researchers work. Therefore, conclusion need not include references.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	NIL	
Optional/General comments	Complete overhaul/revision of the manuscript is necessary and author needs to put dedicated efforts to effectively communicate the results & discussions of this study to the reviewers and readers.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vipin Jain
Department, University & Country	CSIR-National Physical Laboratory, India