



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/ACSJ/1617
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis and Characterization of Nano Structured Zinc(II) Cysteine Complex Under Ultrasound Irradiation.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	ZnO has been synthesized in nano form by various methods as can be found in the literature. The authors made an attempt, in addition to the synthesis of microcrystalline ZnO, synthesis of biologically important zinc(II) cysteine complex also in nano form. Figures seem to be not original. Were they cut and pasted? SEM images are not of good quality and they do not show hexagonal symmetry.	Corrected. The SEM figures are original, but the resolution of the apparatus in the range of 500 nm was low. Figures were not cut and passed. I tried to correct them. I prepared new SEM images, and corrected the manuscript. My mean is ZnO XRD pattern is agreement with the literature values (JCPDS card no. 36-1451), in which consists with the wurtizite hexagonal structure. Corrected the manuscript Figs 1-6.
Specific comments:	In section 2.1 Synthesis of nanostructured Zn(II) Cysteine complex, from the line 101 to the line 105, it is not clear what the authors want to describe. It would be better if they describe the content of the paragraph more clearly. Lines 110 – 111, what is the particle size? In line 116 it is stated that “ taking single crystal was unsuccessful”. It is natural that one cannot take a single crystal in nano form and so this may be deleted.	-Corrected, the second paragraph is jointed to the third one. Line 100, page 3. We describe specification of a new nanostructured Zn(II) cystein complex. -Corrected. line 110 page 3. -Corrected, line 115, page 3. Our goal was synthesis of a Zn(II)cysteine complex in two different ways .For determination of the molecular structure of the complex, we tried to prepare Zn(II) cysteine complex in a branched tube, with the purpose of taking single crystal and determination the structure (it was unsuccessful), after that we run the reaction under ultrasonic irradiation, then we took Zn(II)cysteine complex, in nano sized.
Title and abstract	The title is suitable. The abstract also describes what the authors have done.	
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	Synthesis of Zn(II) Cysteine complex is original. Synthesis of ZnO has been done by many scientists!	We described a new precursor for synthesis of ZnO microstructures. It mean synthesis of ZnO was take place by a new method.
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there	It would be better if the following review article References are added:	



SDI Review Form 1.5

any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	1. Suslick, K.S., Hyeon ,T.,Fang, M. (1996). Nanostuctured Materials Generated by High Intensity Ultrasound: Sonochemical Synthesis and Catalytic Studies., 8,2172-2179 2. Gedanken, A. (2004). Using sonochemistry for the Fabrication of Nanomaterials. Ultrasonics Chemistry., 11, 47-55 The authors have to follow the format of American Chemical Science Journal (example: vol. 2(1):12-24(2012)) for listing the References. Let them check the format of the References in the text also.	-Corrected, Line 46 page 2. -I have followed of the References in the text as the filled attached, SDI-paper-template-2003.
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	The authors have given the details.	
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	In Table 1 the authors have given the indices of XRD diffraction plane and not the Miller indices. Let them change the caption for the same. Further, the (hkl) values must be given in closed brackets. Better if they are shown against the XRD peak positions. No need of statistical analysis.	Corrected, Fig. 6, page 9.
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No ethical or completing interest issues.	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	Conclusion is based on the supported data.	
References	It would be better if the following review article References are added: 1. Suslick, K.S., Hyeon ,T.,Fang, M. (1996). Nanostuctured Materials Generated by High Intensity Ultrasound: Sonochemical Synthesis and Catalytic Studies., 8,2172-2179 2. Gedanken, A. (2004). Using sonochemistry for the Fabrication of Nanomaterials. Ultrasonics Chemistry., 11, 47-55 The authors have to follow the format of American Chemical Science Journal (example: vol. 2(1):12-24(2012)) for listing the References. Let them check the format of the References in the text also.	Corrected, Line 46 page 2. -I have followed of the References in the text as the filled attached, SDI-paper-template-2003.

The authors need to replace the present SEM images with good quality images.