

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_126926
Title of the Manuscript:	Improved solubilization of the insecticide phosalone in anionic and cationic aqueous media by the conductometric method
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Goal of the research is perfect, improving solubility of pesticide in water in order to make its degradation easy, which prevent soil pollution as well.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, my suggested title is; "Enhanced solubilisation of insecticide phosalone by using anionic and cationic surfactants in aqueous solution by micellization"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No, the title and first line of the abstract is not matching. Put the title what I have suggested and change the first line of the abstract accordingly.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	OK	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research is ok, but the logic is not clear. Let me explain. If you are considering pesticide as polar (as you mentioned high dipole moment in Result and Discussion section) and its interaction with polar head group of the surfactant(s). How micelle is formed then ? How pesticide molecule will be encapsulated in core of the micelle in aq. solution?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes,	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is OK.	
Optional/General comments	Gemini surfactants encapsulate more efficiently than conventional surfactants, why the researcher didn't use Gemini surfactant as he included 'geminis' in his references.	

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:	Nirmal Singh
Department, University & Country	R.S.D.College, Panjab University, India