

Overall the work is written in a vague manner without direct means for relevant confirmations. This work also made the impression for reproducing already published works published years ago but not yet fully cited them. This "gave the chance" of this work to pretend to be the initial discoveries. The morphologies of the NPs demonstrate that this study did not yet optimize the system. Only switching on the generator and collecting them for subsequent analysis cannot add scientific values, particularly ignoring the large volume of literature, which reported almost the same line of argumentations. The authors also try to use artificially texted letters to mark the different metals without showing any experimental proofs. Raising such concern is mainly due to all their similar appearances but undistinguishable nature from the TEM results.

Large body of relevant literature was severely missing.

Primary particle was defined scientifically incorrect.

where the authors showed the 1-nm particles?

Melting point of the 4 metals cannot be directly used to evaluate their different particle sizes, as the impure surface of the particles also makes dramatic influences.

How the authors prove that the oxidation took place during NP production?

Why the mass was evacuated using micro molar? As the authors also claimed that the SDG can also deliver NPs of high quantity. How the amount of micro molar supports the aforementioned claim?

For the different production rates of the metals, previous study already clearly explained why. Please cite the relevant literature, not only saving the unnecessarily repeated work but also not making an impression of confined literature review.

The authors also argued that the mismatch of size distributions measured between the TEM analysis and SMPS data is mainly due to the low counting efficiency from the latter. How to explain the overestimation of diffusional deposition of smaller NPs for TEM analysis?

A very puzzled presentation for Fig. 5 onwards is to remove the Cu NPs. Could the authors provide any scientific reasons for such inconsistencies?

How the edges of the NPs were determined when using eq. 1 to calculate circularity?

How the authors separate the ones coated over TiO₂ with those of self-coagulation?

Other mistakes also showed the carelessness and this can also give the reviewer for scientific suspect. Wrong spelling in page1, "Department od Environmental Sciences" should be "Department of Environmental Sciences".