

## ReviewForm1.7

JournalName:	<a href="#">ChemicalScienceInternationalJournal</a>
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_CSIJ_97965
TitleoftheManuscript:	RESEARCHOFTHECOMPOSITIONOFPHOSPHOGYPSUM PRODUCEDDURINGTHEEXTRACTINGOFPHOSPHANEACIDFROM ORDINARYPHOSPHORITE POWDER BY THE CLINKER METHOD
TypeoftheArticle	

### **GeneralguidelineforPeerReview process:**

Thisjournal's peerreviewpolicystates that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lackofNovelty**', 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>

## ReviewForm1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for academic research and for commercial purposes.</p> <p>2. In the article the authors must replace phosphoric acid for orthophosphoric (or phosphoric) acid.</p> <p>3. The abstract is quite confusing. Several long phrases are used and this makes the text difficult to understand. This structure is also adopted in the remaining parts of the article.</p> <p>4. There are no subsections neither important experimental details about reagent's quality, equipment and quality control. I should suggest a better organization of the text itself. Using more graphical elements as flow chart for instance.</p> <p>5. The manuscript seems to be scientifically correct however, once quality control parameters are not shown, it is difficult to assure the data could be reproduced by anyone.</p> <p>6. There are only few recent articles, because of that, we cannot say the reference list is up-to-date.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Several problems with English structure can be observed, as long phrases, the use of commas instead of points in numbers (results), misuse of pronouns, and so on. I should suggest a revision done by an English specialist.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Roseli F Gennari
Department, University & Country	Physics Institute of University of São Paulo, Brazil