



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_45545
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review on Nanotechnology: Analytical Techniques used and Applications
Type of the Article	Review Paper

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The whole manuscript need total reviews in term of aim of the review, scientific flow of the writing a review paper. The Author need to explain to the reader what is novel in his review and what necessitated the review. The referencing and citation of other authors in the reviews is very poor. Since the paper is a review article it need to clear most issue of controversies between different author with respect to the title with the support of author opinion on the argument as the case may be, as his/her contribution to knowledge. Therefore, I strongly recommend the paper should be reviewed again as whole with respect the title and scientific flow and pattern of review paper writing.	The body of the manuscript was re-modified as per the valuable comments of the reviewer
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The paper also need a total English grammar editing, however, many typo errors in spelling were observed	Rechecked and corrected again
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Total general reviews of the paper with respect scientific review writing and the references should be consistent and they should be full listed in the reference list	Corrected as per the reviewer comments