

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)
<p>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.</p>		
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>		
<p>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.</p>		
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		
<p>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.</p>		
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Here is some General comments for the paper titled "Synthesis and Characterization of Caladium bicolor-Stabilized Iron Nanoparticle"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Originality Caladium bicolour is used as a stabilising ingredient in this study's innovative method of creating iron nanoparticles. This is an intriguing addition to the fields of green chemistry and nanotechnology. Research on the creation of nanoparticles using plant extracts is expanding, and this work provides important new information. 2. Methodology : The selection of Caladium bicolour as a stabilising agent is warranted, and the synthesis procedure is thoroughly explained. To improve reproducibility, it would be helpful to provide further information on how to optimise the synthesis parameters (such as temperature, reaction time, and plant extract concentration). 3. Characterization Techniques It is acceptable to characterise the produced nanoparticles using methods like FTIR, XRD, TEM, and UV-Vis spectroscopy. Although the data are presented in an understandable manner, the analysis would be strengthened by more explanation of the consequences of the observed characteristics (such as size, form, and stability). 4. Findings and Conversation: Overall, the results are presented in an understandable and well-structured manner. A more thorough comparison with previous research on iron nanoparticles made with different plant extracts, however, would enhance the discussion. This would show the benefits of employing Caladium bicolour and give the results a wider context. 5. It is beneficial to include recent reference 6. In term of clarity : Although the work is written effectively overall, there are a few strange phrasings and grammatical problems. To increase readability and clarity, a comprehensive proofreading is advised 7. It is better to address research gap for feature work 	

Review Form 3

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:	Gudisa Hailu Chala
Department, University & Country	Wollega University, Ethiopia