

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_126031
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis and Characterization of Caladium bicolor-Stabilized Iron Nanoparticle
Type of the 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The article was well written, this low to medium range surface area is indicative that the synthesized nanoparticle is also suitable for applications like energy storage and drug delivery was the important application of this work	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, Title is suitable	
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, authors can revise the abstract of their article	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, appropriate	
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.	Abstract, results and discussion should improved with more references Article can be accepted after minor revision Figure are legible (except figure 4)	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More references should be aded	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, article can be revised, after minor revision it can be accepted	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A. Ayeshamariam
Department, University & Country	Khadir Mohideen College, India