

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_103354
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Efficacy of Ficus Benghalensis-Assisted Copper oxide nanoparticles for Congo Red Dye Adsorption
Type of the Article	Technical

### 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.journalajocs.com/index.php/AJOCS/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write 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></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript may contribute to the scientific community as the article treat a dye which has been widely used in textile industry. The untreated dye may cause harm and pollute the environment which lead to health issue.</p> <p>The title provided is not suitable as the article focusses on removal of congo red dye using Ficus Benghalensis-Assisted Copper oxide nanoparticles. The 'exploring' words is not suitable, hence I recommended to change the title.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>The title of subsections is appropriate but the format is unfavourable. Please recheck.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes. However, please check the format of list of the references.</p> <p>The comments and suggestions have been included in the manuscript. Please check it carefully and do the improvements to ensure the journal standard.</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>Suitable</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall, the content is adequate, but the format have many errors for figures, label, axis title, captions and etc.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nur Amirah Mohd Zahri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>SEGi University, Malaysia</b>