



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_40831
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis, Characterization of Novel Cationic Polyurethane Polymeric Surfactants: Content Saturated Chain
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	<p>(a) Is the subject matter appropriate for the Journal? Yes</p> <p>(b) Is the title reflects the contents adequately? No¹</p> <p>(c) Is the abstract informative? No²</p> <p>(d) Is there any data which might be omitted? Yes³</p> <p>(e) Any apparent errors of fact or logic? Yes⁴</p> <p>(f) Any apparent lack of clarity? Yes⁵</p> <p>(g) Is the conclusions sound and justified? No⁶</p> <p>(h) Is appropriate reference to previous work given? Yes</p> <p>(i) Is the quality of the presentation adequate? No⁷</p> <p>(j) Is the work contains new and original contributions? Yes</p> <p>¹There is no silver nanohybrid mentioned.</p> <p>²The results are not revealed.</p> <p>³No NMR data provided.</p> <p>⁴The confirmation of the synthesized compound structures only relied on one spectrometer result.</p> <p>⁵The objectives of the research are not very clear.</p> <p>⁶No conclusion presented.</p> <p>⁷The quality of the manuscript is very low even though a lot of results were imparted.</p>	<p>(a) ---</p> <p>(b) The title was corrected and now it is suitable for the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>(c) The abstract was revised and corrected according to the reviewer comment.</p> <p>(d) ---</p> <p>(e) ---</p> <p>(f) ---</p> <p>(g) Conclusion section was provided and it is sounding for the content of the manuscript.</p> <p>(h) ---</p> <p>(i) The presentation of the manuscript was revised and detailed explained.</p> <p>(J) ---</p> <p>(1) The nanocomposites were described in the manuscript briefly.</p> <p>(2) The results were described according to the obtained data and now are revealed to the manuscript content.</p> <p>(3) The prepared compounds are polymeric compounds with high molecular weights, so that the NMR data will not be useful in their structure determination, but the FTIR spectra are more useful in describing the compounds functionality.</p> <p>(4) The confirmation of the structure was performed according to the FTIR and the molecular weight determination; these analyses are adequate for their relative structures.</p> <p>(5) The objective of the manuscript was described in the last section of the introduction.</p> <p>(6) Conclusion section was provided in the manuscript.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript studies on the influence of the fatty acid on the surface activity of the cationic polyurethane polymeric surfactant. The authors not give an extensive introduction regarding the cationic polymeric surfactants and the silver nanohybrids. From the results of manuscript, it can be seen that the particle size of the cationic polyurethane nanohybrids increases, the surface area and the surface free energy decreases.	The introduction was revised and improved.
Optional/General comments	Moreover, there are a lot of grammatical and typographical errors found in the manuscript. The language should be corrected thoroughly throughout manuscript with scientific words.	The grammar of the manuscript was revised.