Article reference: nanomaterials-890099

In this article, the authors have synthesized the hexaferrite series, $Pb_{1-x}La_xFe_{12-x}Zn_xO_{19}$, and then used them to prepare composite ceramics by alloying with an industrial lead titanate zirconate (PZT)-based piezoelectric material. The article contains basic phase analysis (from X-ray diffraction) of the hexaferrites and an investigation of the magnetic and magnetoelectric properties of the composites. The samples investigated in this work are new with interesting properties that can have potential applications. However, I have several concerns (see below) that need to be suitably addressed before the article can be considered for publication.

1. The introduction is relatively well written. However, while the authors have cited several references for hexaferrite-based multiferroic composites, they have included very few references for PZT-based multiferroic composites. In addition to references of composites based on the industrially available PZTNB-1 (essentially previous work from the same group), the authors should also add recent references of laboratory-based synthesis of PZT-based multiferroic composites. See, for example, *Journal of Magnetism and Magnetic Materials 511 (2020) 166792, doi: 10.1016/j.jmmm.2020.166792*. Such references should be cited in the manuscript to enrich the introduction further.

2. The authors claim from the XRD patterns shown in Fig. 5b that "with an increase in the content of alloying additives within the range of $0 < x < 0.5$, a decrease in hematite reflection intensities has been recorded". This is not correct. For example, it seems to me that the hematite content in the $x = 0.3$ sample is higher than that in the $x = 0.1$ sample. In any case, what is unarguable is that Fe_2O_3 is present in all the samples. In such a case, the bold statements made by the authors in the abstract and conclusion stating that "products containing virtually no impurities" were obtained is misleading, to say the least. These need to be suitably modified, and the information that the samples do contain Fe_2O_3 impurities needs to be mentioned in the abstract as well as conclusion so as to not mislead future readers of this paper.

3. In the same section, the authors also state that "introducing alloying additives La^{3+} and Zn^{2+} helps stabilize the hexaferrite phase". I am not very sure about this statement. If this was indeed true, then why is the hexaferrite phase destabilized when the doping concentration is increased beyond $x = 0.5$? I suggest the authors modify the discussion here, and state only that for $x < 0.5$, Fe_2O_3 is the only impurity phase observed, while for $x > 0.5$, other impurity phases like $LaFeO_3$ also come into existence.

4. At the end of page 8, the authors use the phrase "single-phase products". As emphasized in my earlier comment (comment 2), these are not single-phase products.

5. At the end of page 8 and beginning of page 9, the authors have quoted the "averaged values" of several electric and and magnetic parameters of the samples. Such averaged values makes no sense to me. Even if these parameters are weakly dependent on the value of *x*, I would still like to know what they are. The authors should make a table here, listing the parameters for all the samples.

6. The authors have shown the X-ray diffraction pattern of one composite in Fig. 6, and mentioned in the text that the X-ray diffraction patterns for the other composites are "essentially the same". Even if this is true, for the sake of completion, readers like me would like to see the X-ray diffraction patterns of all the composites. These need to be shown, if not in the main manuscript, then at least as supplementary information.

7. While discussing the SEM images, the authors mention that the ferrites have small grains with sizes less than 2 μm. Do they have some idea of the crystallite size of the hexaferrites from the X-ray diffraction data? Is it in the nanometer range? This information is relevant, especially since this article has been submitted for publication in a journal dedicated to nanomaterials.

8. While discussing the SEM images, the authors further state that the characteristic hexagonal shape of the largest crystallites of the hexaferrite phase can be noted. However, this is not very obvious to me from the images shown in Fig. 7.

9. Towards the end of page 10 (after Fig. 8), the authors state that the magnetic properties of the hexaferrites with different values of *x* are rather close to each other. Even if this is true, I would like to see the magnetic properties of the different samples. Please also refer to my comment 5 in this regard.

10. At the end of page 10, the authors state that the "forms" of the hysteresis loops differ little from each other. By "forms", I am assuming that the authors mean "shape". What about the absolute values of H_C, M_r, and M_S? This is related to my previous comments (comments 5 and 9).

11. At the end of page 10 and beginning of page 11, the authors state that with an increase in the alloying additives in the ferrite composition, the magnetic softness of the composite ceramics increases. If there is not much difference in the magnetic properties of the ferrites themselves (as a function of *x*), then why does the magnetic softness of the composites increase with an increase in the value of *x*? In fact, the authors themselves concede that this is an unexpected result. Do the authors have any explanation for why this happens apart from saying that it is a result of the "interphase alloying process", which is a rather vague explanation? The interphase alloying process is present for all the composites, then why does the magnetic softness increase with an increase in the content of alloying components in the hexaferrite composition?