

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Chemical Science International Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_CSIJ_92538 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | ENRICHED SUPERPHOSPHATE AND AMMOPHOSPHATE FERTILIZER BASED ON WASHED DRIED PHOSPHORITE CONCENTRATE |
| Type of the Article | |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | 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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Compulsory REVISION comments | <p>The study is concise and of great interest to fertilizer manufacturers. But the following needs to be addressed to correct some inconsistencies and overall quality of the manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authors cited Fig. 3 in the manuscript but no " Fig 3: Decomposition and neutralization essay" was presented • Authors claimed "A process flow diagram was developed and the material balance of enriched superphosphate and ammophosphate in a single process cycle was calculated" but no process flow diagram was presented and no material balance data was provided in the manuscript. • The same claim was made in the conclusion "Based on laboratory experiments, the material balance of enriched superphosphate and concentrated ammophosphate in a single technological cycle is calculated." • Authors should rewrite this statement, it is not clear what the authors meant "Therefore, in order for support acceptable efficiency of phosphate raw material processing into quality ammophosphate and enriched superphosphate, this work is a purpose of the present research. " • Authors claimed "The quality of the ammophosphate fertilizers we obtain is not inferior to it, and in some parameters they are even superior." Can the authors mention the superior parameters? • Can authors mark out the identified compounds on the radiographs, that is, draw an arrow pointing to the specific peaks and write out the names of the compounds on the graphs | |
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Optional/General comments | Quite informative | |

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | 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) | |

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Adefarati Oloruntoba |
| Department, University & Country | China University of Petroleum Beijing, China |