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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript is original in terms of its subject. Some deficiencies must be corrected, and then they can be accepted. For example, more literature should be added in the Introduction section; thus will strengthen this work. The authors should give more comments on the subject in the Results and Discussions section. In the Conclusion section, all results of the study should be summarized in more detail. If it is clarified for what purpose these results can be used; The manuscript will be better. In general, English language and spelling errors should be re-examined. Existing bugs are fixed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is appropriate.	
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.	Abstract is not comprehensive. The key part of a work is the abstract. It is necessary for the abstract to be a little more detailed so that readers can understand and evaluate the subject better. The abstract is kept quite short. What is a reasonable mechanism? It would be very helpful to give more details about him. What is the final conclusion reached by the authors in the abstract? please explain?	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections of the article; It should be regulated in more detail as I mentioned above.	
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.	This study is scientifically accurate. From a technical perspective, it should be supported by more literature studies. Additionally, authors should add their own comments to this article. It would be useful to explain the mechanism in more detail in the article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not sufficient, more current references should be added. What kind of literature studies have been done on this subject, especially in the last 10 years (between 2014-2024) and are they consistent with the results of this article? or isn't it? This should be evaluated.	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 2 (08-07-2024)

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is quite simple. In order for the quality of English to be suitable for scientific communication; The English language and spelling of the entire article should be checked. I believe that this will be a much more understandable and scientific study.	
Optional/General comments	This article will be a very original, up-to-date and scientifically acceptable study when the deficiencies in the points I mentioned above are corrected.	

PART 2:

		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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rukiye Oztekin
Department, University & Country	Dokuz Eylul University, Turkey

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 2 (08-07-2024)