SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Chemical Science International Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_CSIJ_47662**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Synthesis and Characterization of Nano-Strontium Oxide(SrO) using Erzin Cimin Grape (Vitis Vinifera, Cimin)**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**There are various mistakes in the manuscript, for example: line 24 is incomplete, line 31 is confusing (it talks about nanoparticles but later talks about fruits and vegetables), line 50 has a mistake. Overall the manuscript is not easy to understand. The authors should enhance the way they present the information including abstract, introduction and results.** **Line 68 is confusing.** **Line 65-68 is confusing. The authors should write the procedure clearer.** **Line 74-75 is also confusing. It is not clear what is the reaction mixture. The authors should explain better this procedure.** **Line 89-92: The authors say that the spectrophotometer was monitored. This is confusing. It should say the reaction was monitored using a spectrophotometer. This procedure also needs to be explained with more details and clearer.** **The experimental section from line 94 to line 113 should be explained with more details as well.** **The results and discussion section is confusing, the authors say that they used FT-IR chromatography techniques, however in the figures it says SEM chromatography. Additionally, they do not explain sample preparation or other details for these techniques. Overall the results and discussion section needs to be explained in more detail.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Merlis P. Alvarez-Berrios***
Department, University & Country	***Inter American University of Puerto Rico-Ponce Campus, USA***