



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 It is interesting to see the ultrasound assisted complex formation. The major drawback is that the authors should test the same reaction in the absence of ultrasound so that the role of ultrasound is clear. Without this the claim is not correct.	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:	• Usage of capital letters should be followed wherever required. •	
Specific comments:	NIL	
Title and abstract	• Title reflects the objective of this investigation. • Abstract: Check: Mercuptonoic acid	
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	• Rephrase: "...almost exclusive entry reaction...." • Check : ⁹⁹TC • Ultra sonic should be as ultrasonic • Metal oxide as metal oxides • "...scientific community as a future material". Explain further. • "... present work is to synthesizes..." to "... present work is to synthesize..."	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	Fine.	
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)	• Check the statement: "...Microanalyses were measurement". • "The Compound.." to "The compound..." • "gr" to "g" •	
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?)	• Why the yield was 77 %? • How do you calculate the yield of ZnO from EDAX (100 %)? • Page 6: 2nd para: Completely rephrase. Some sentences are repeating. • In the scheme 1, the degree is missing (in the temperature). • Fig. 1 SEM is blurred. Authors should report a good image. •	
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No	



SDI Review Form 1.5

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)	Yes.	
References	• Check the proper way of representing the references.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	SIVAKUMAR MANICKAM
Department, University & Country	CHEMICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGG., UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM, MALAYSIA