

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_92474
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPONENTIAL MODEL FOR ADSORPTION KINETICS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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	No apply.	
Minor REVISION comments	No apply.	
Optional/General comments	<p>It is an interesting manuscript focused on kinetics models of adsorption mechanism and inter-particle interactions. It merits to be published.</p> <p>However, please consider the following comments: i) In the abstract is not clear the objective of this manuscript. ii) The same comment in the introduction. It is described many mechanism but it is not concluded about what was developed in this manuscript.; or unless is not clear for neophytes in the theme looking to get knowledge in the field.</p> <p>Please revise that. iii) Check the organization of the subsections. It is not clear as well what is previously developed and what was proposed by the authors in this manuscript. Check the assigned numbers. As well check the author Guidelines for the organization in this manuscript and type of proposed article. Iv) The conclusions are short and it is not discussed the models proposed.</p> <p>It missing maybe comparison, more discussion related with other models. Moreover, it is stated that this model fit very well for data, But what type of data? Where is the data, the reactions, interactions occurring? Consider to add more details about it.</p>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Guillermo Bracamonte
Department, University & Country	National University of Cordoba, Argentine