

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_118152
Title of the Manuscript:	Nanoscale zero-valent silver and graphene oxide nanoparticles: facile synthesis and characterization
Type of the Article	Peer Review

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript addresses a highly relevant topic in the field of nanotechnology, particularly focusing on the synthesis and characterization of novel nanomaterials. This is a significant area of research due to the potential applications of these materials in various industries, including electronics, medicine, and environmental remediation. 2. The title is suggested to be changed to Facile Synthesis and Characterization of Nanoscale Zero-Valent Silver and Graphene Oxide Nanoparticles. 3. The abstract does not provide any context or background information about the research topic. It is important to briefly introduce the area of study and explain why the research is significant or what gap it aims to fill. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract fails to clearly state the research objectives or hypothesis. Readers need to know what the study aims to achieve or test. - The abstract does not discuss any results or findings from the research. Including key results is essential to give readers an idea of what was discovered or proven. - There is no discussion of the implications or significance of the results. A brief discussion helps readers understand the importance of the findings. - The abstract lacks a conclusion that summarizes the main points and provides a final take-away message. Conclusions help reinforce the importance of the research and its contributions. - The abstract is too vague and does not provide enough specific information to understand the research. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript need to be revised and corrected accordingly. To enhance clarity and readability, I suggest organizing the manuscript into well-defined sections such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. Each section should be clearly delineated and follow a logical flow to facilitate understanding of the research process and findings. 5. Overall, the research presented in the manuscript seems scientifically accurate. However, a few more details in the methods section and a more comprehensive discussion of the results could enhance the manuscript's scientific robustness. 6. The manuscript would benefit from the inclusion of more recent references to ensure that the study is positioned within the latest developments in the field. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Overall, the language quality is fairly good, but there are areas that need attention to meet the high standards expected in scholarly communications. Polishing the manuscript through careful editing and proofreading will ensure that it effectively communicates the research to a broader audience.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding more recent references to the literature review to ensure that the study is positioned within the latest research developments. - The figures and tables are informative, but some could be enhanced with more detailed captions and discussion to help readers understand the data. - The conclusion section should be expanded to summarize the key findings and suggest possible directions for future research. - The results are not presented clearly, not have a deeper discussion of the implications and limitations of the study. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Norliza Dzakaria
Department, University & Country	Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Malaysia