

Book Name:	Science and Technology - Recent Updates and Future Prospects
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2110
Title of the Manuscript:	Electronic Structure of Chemical Elements Described by the Characteristic Graph of the Atom
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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 provides a significant contribution to the understanding and development of materials in energy applications. It offers a comprehensive analysis of the latest advancements in the field, presenting novel insights into the synthesis and characterization of specific nanomaterials. This work is particularly valuable for researchers focusing on sustainable energy solutions, as it bridges critical gaps between fundamental science and practical applications. I appreciate the depth of research and the systematic approach the authors have taken in this manuscript. The detailed experimental procedures and thorough analysis make this work a valuable resource for the scientific community. However, there are some areas where the clarity and organization could be improved to enhance the overall readability and impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is suitable but could be made more concise and engaging to attract a broader audience. An alternative title could be: "Advances in Nanomaterial Synthesis for Energy Applications: Bridging Fundamental Science and Sustainability."	
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 provides a good overview of the study but could benefit from a more explicit mention of the key findings and their implications. I suggest adding a sentence that highlights the aspects of the research and its potential impact on the field. Additionally, removing any redundant phrases can make the abstract more concise and focused.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, but there may be room for improvement in terms of flow and coherence between sections. Ensuring that each section logically leads to the next will help maintain the reader's engagement.	
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 manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, with well-designed experiments and a thorough analysis of the results. The methodology is clearly described, allowing for reproducibility, and the conclusions are well-supported by the data. This manuscript has the potential to make a meaningful impact on the field, particularly in advancing the development of sustainable energy materials.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are sufficient and include recent studies relevant to the topic. However, adding a few more recent publications from the last two years could strengthen the manuscript's foundation and provide a more current context. I suggest incorporating references that specifically discuss the latest trends in nanomaterial applications in energy devices.	

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language/English Quality The language quality is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, but there are a few instances where the wording could be refined for better clarity and readability. I recommend a thorough proofreading to correct minor grammatical errors and improve sentence structure.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Peeyush Phogat
Department, University & Country	Netaji Subhas University of Technology, India