

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_84802
Title of the Manuscript:	CONTROLLED CATALYTIC REDUCTION IN SYNTHESISING PURE TETRAHYDROCURCUMIN
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalajocs.com/index.php/AJOCS/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1.The "Introduction is weak". It is missing in literature review and hence hypothesis is not developed. It must be beefed-up. 2. The references on the previous work done in the area by Peter, Su-Lin, Chtchwan, etc, described in the R & D section, should be summarized (one or two sentences on only on each) and brought to the Introduction section. 3. After describing the previous works, the author should talk about their limitation and then their own work to be done in this study. 4. In my opinion the paragraph starting with "The present article is directed towards---" in the R & D section should be the last sentence of Introduction section. 5. There are no recent references cited in the manuscript. The latest ref is from 2012. The authors must cite new references to justify that the are of study is of current interest.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It appears that the references are not uniform. In refs 2 and 3, journals' name should be abbreviated. Put the first and last page of the cited refs. or follow the journal's style.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript is acceptable for publication after the necessary revision suggested above.	

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:	Girija S. Singh
Department, University & Country	University of Botswana, Botswana