



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Chemical Science Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACSJ_25749
Title of the Manuscript:	LABORATORY PREPARATION OF THE PRECURSOR FOR SYNTHESIS OF GOLD NANOPARTICLES
Type of Article	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The authors have done a good work in order to improve the paper, following the referee's suggestions. However, in my opinion, they don't have answered and considered some important referee's comments. First of all, only one literature reference has been added (Preethika Soanpet, Samatha. D, Ala Surendra babu, Divya Bharathi and Ram Raj, Gold Nanoparticles for the Treatment of Cancer: Review. World Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences Volume 5, Issue 02, 2016, pp.381-392). Again I suggest to update the literature references and their number. Secondly, I asked to explain better the sentences "Three different gold concentrations gave different particle size distribution curves [24]." and "In another study, the monodisperse nanogold with different particle sizes were obtained by the same procedure with different amounts of citrate [25]." reporting the three gold concentrations, the different particle size distributions for the first sentence and the dimensions of the obtained monodisperse gold nanoparticles and the used amounts of citrate for the second one. The authors have rephrased the sentences in question but they haven't added anything of the asked information. Is it possible to include all this information? In my opinion, they could be very useful to the reader. Thirdly, I agree with the answer given by the authors according to which other characterization requirements have been recommended for further research, but I don't agree that the study of the effect of different gold concentrations on the size and shape of the obtained gold nanoparticles as well as the effect of different sodium citrate concentrations is again recommended for further research. Can the authors study at least the effect of another different gold concentration? Moreover, I have seen that no graph showing the distribution of sizes of gold nanoparticles has been added and I agree with this because I have read that the numbers of particles from which the authors have known the average diameters are three and five particles. Considering only these particles I understand that it is not possible to make a graph showing the distribution of sizes. However, I think that the authors have considered only very few particles, not making the measures suitable. In my opinion, the authors should consider at least 100 particles in order to know the average diameters from TEM images and considering 100 particles it is also possible to make the graphs.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Claudia Antonetti</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Chemistry and Industrial Chemistry, University of Pisa, Pisa, Italy</i>