



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	2014_IRJPAC_9624
Title of the Manuscript:	Support Material Effect for Pt Catalytic Activity
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:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	- Line 108,109 and 120, Author mention that samples are characterized by XRD and TG/DTA but result of XRD and TG/DTA not found in manuscript. - Line 226-288, how Pt subnano-clusters are responsible for causing ORR activity of Pt-GNS and Pt-NG. - Line 244, It is indicated that GNS and N-G significantly influence the π-d in terms of Pt electronic structure. But, too, no arguments or clear description is given to illustrate it. Even if this effect has no big influence, arguments anyway are needed.	
Minor REVISION comments	- Line 132-134, statement of this these line not clear. Author should clear this statement what he want to say. - Line 183,184, author write "this data indicates the catalyst support material affects the diffusion limiting currents values" where is this data in your manuscript. - Raman spectroscopy has been widely applied to exploit the structural and electronic properties of graphene, including layer numbers, stacking order, strain effect, and doping concentration. Author should consider the use of a more suited analysis technique (e.g. Raman spectroscopy) in addition. - Conclusions need more clarity, more emphasis on the main result of the paper. It should be revised.	
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer