

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Recent Developments in Chemistry and Biochemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3626
Title of the Manuscript:	Kinetics of Oxidation of Allyl Alcohol by Cr(VI)
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript lacks a broader contextual discussion, such as comparisons with similar oxidants or applications of the findings, which would enhance its relevance to the scientific community. Additionally, some sections are repetitive or poorly structured, and the language could be more polished for better readability and impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggested title "Mechanistic and Kinetic Study of Allyl Alcohol Oxidation Using Quinaldinium Chlorochromate in Acetic Acid Medium"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract in a book chapter should act as a summary of the chapter's content while addressing the broader significance. Consider rewriting it to emphasize both the findings and the importance of studying such oxidations in synthetic chemistry.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some subsections could be restructured for better clarity; for instance, grouping experimental details under clear subheadings and dividing the discussion into smaller thematic subsections for example, "Kinetics Analysis" and "Thermodynamic Parameters"	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with well-executed experiments and accurate interpretations of the kinetic data. The proposed mechanism is plausible and supported by the results, including activation parameters and the effects of varying reaction conditions. However, additional comparisons to similar oxidation studies would strengthen its scientific rigor and contextual relevance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references provided are comprehensive and cover foundational studies relevant to the topic. However, many cited works are quite dated, with most references being older than 20 years. Including more recent studies, particularly those focusing on oxidation reactions with Cr(VI) or related kinetic mechanisms, would enhance the manuscript's relevance and show engagement with current research trends.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<input type="checkbox"/> Some sentences need rephrasing to meet this standard. For example, the sentence <i>"The rate of the reaction is decreases with the decrease in the dielectric constant"</i> should be revised to <i>"The reaction rate decreases as the dielectric constant of the medium decreases."</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Avoid abrupt transitions between sections. Smoothly guide the reader from one topic to the next with connecting statements.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<input type="checkbox"/> Proofread thoroughly for grammar and syntax errors. <input type="checkbox"/> Enhance the discussion by integrating more comparative analysis with existing literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Revise figures and tables for better presentation and integration into the text. <input type="checkbox"/> Add a section on potential applications of this study's findings to highlight its broader impact.	

[Review Form 2](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khalid Ahmed
Department, University & Country	University of Karachi, Pakistan