

Paper: “Application of Nanotechnology in a Novel Air Purifier for Remediation of Airborne Pathogen and to Prevent the Spread of COVID-19”

Submitted: 12 September 2022

Accepted: 18 April 2023

Published: 30 April 2023

Corresponding Author: Nabarun Ghosh

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2023.v19n12p1](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2023.v19n12p1)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Amanze Ikwu
Holsworthy Medical Center, UK

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 25/11/2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 01/12/2022
Manuscript Title: Application of nanotechnology for remediation of airborne pathogen using novel air purifier to prevent the spread of COVID-19	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 78.09.22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	1

<i>The authors don't present all subdivisions of abstract (objects and methods). They present citations in this part. They need to learn more manuscript to know how to present article</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	2
<i>This was also described as a results</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	1
Not clear. Need to rewrite	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	0
<i>The authors didn't write the conclusion</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>Need to improve</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Accepted, minor revision needed	<input type="checkbox"/>
Return for major revision and resubmission	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reject	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The authors need to learn more manuscripts to know how to present it.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2022

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Amanze Ikwu	Email:
University/Country: Holsworthy Medical Center, UK	
Date Manuscript Received: 20/12/22	Date Review Report Submitted: 12/02/23
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0978/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>The title is clear, however the authors needs to elaborate how this study prevents the spread of COVID-19</i>	

2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>The abstract is unclear and generalized. Revise the abstract entirely and add the main points or summary of your objective, methods and your result. Explain the full meaning of some abbreviations in the abstract Eg. CO, NOx, Sox, and O3.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	5
<i>The manuscript is written in good English</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	
<i>The study methods are not clearly explained. What is the size of SARS CoV-2 virus? Could you clearly explain how this experiment prevents the transmission of COVID-19 virus.</i>	3
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	
<i>Correlate the result of this study with your objective. Did you meet your specific objective of reducing the spread of airborne pathogens and COVID-19, in particular. Clearly explain how this objective is met.</i>	3
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>The conclusion is scanty. You need more robust discussion to support the content of your study</i>	2
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>Are the master's thesis in your reference available online? Perhaps when you improve your work, I expect more references that are appropriate</i>	3

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	X
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

As above

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

I did not check if the referencing style complies with your journal. This needs to be cross-checked by your Editing team. Many thanks for asking me to review this manuscript.