

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_106194
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical, Electrochemical and Plasma Polymerization of Pyrrole-Aniline Copolymers and Their Characterization
Type of the 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The authors presented somewhat interesting research work on the synthesis of Pyrrole-aniline copolymers using three different methods. They have characterized their prepared materials via FTIR, TGA, SEM, and conductivity testing. The title and abstract are relatively fine, scientifically sound.</p> <p>However, I have several challenging doubts in my mind regarding the research.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction part is very short, lacking the significance of your aimed research gap. You must add very recent relevant studies to this part.</li> <li>2. Why you opted the comparison studies of these three methods? I can see that the literature is full of comparison studies. You can either study the novel of these methods in more details to attract scientific readers of the research area.</li> <li>3. I also noticed that your Figures are in the form images captured from the testing equipment with very poor resolution. See your TGA. Also the SEM images are not clear enough.</li> <li>4. In FTIR the peaks must be assigned in the Figure. Also you must relate your characterization results with relevant literature.</li> <li>5. You are suggested to use XRD which is very important characterization for different materials.</li> <li>6. I would say the English language needs some revisions too.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Minor changes needed	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Asfandyar Khan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Textile University, Pakistan</b>