

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_98070
Title of the Manuscript:	Kinetic Viewpoint of BTEX Removal Using Ehugbo-Nigerian Kaolinite Clay Modified with Hexadecyltrimethylammonium Chloride (HDTMAC)
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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The article is an original research work on the <i>Kinetic Viewpoint of BTEX Removal Using Ehugbo-Nigerian Kaolinite Clay Modified with Hexadecyltrimethylammonium Chloride (HDTMAC)</i>. It contributes to an important aspect of wastewater treatment and environmental engineering. Overall, it is a good article and may be accepted after the suggested changes have been implemented.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>i. The keywords are traditionally written in alphabetical order separated by semicolons.</p> <p>ii. The author(s) should add a "future scope of study" section after the conclusion section, describing in brief how this current research can help in future wastewater treatment research and related policies.</p> <p>iii. There are minor formatting issues in the article. Some of them have been highlighted by the reviewer for the author(s) to rectify.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Avdesh Bhardawaj
Department, University & Country	India