

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_110112
Title of the Manuscript:	Electrochemically Generated Aluminum-Species for Remediation of Waste Water containing 2, 4-Dichlorophenol
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? 2. Is the title of the article suitable? 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u> 	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the significant issue of wastewater treatment and offers a novel approach using electrochemically generated aluminum oxyhydroxide.</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the focus on the remediation of wastewater containing 2,4-Dichlorophenol using electrochemically generated aluminum species.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the experimental approach, findings, and implications of the study.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, facilitating a logical flow of information from introduction to experimental details and results.</p> <p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, with detailed experimental procedures and data presentation supporting the study's conclusions.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent, but additional references related to recent advancements in electrocoagulation or wastewater treatment methods could further enrich the literature review.</p> <p>Strength of the manuscript:</p> <p>Experimental Rigor: The detailed description of the experimental setup and procedures adds to the reliability of the study. The use of both adsorption and electrocoagulation methods contributes to a comprehensive assessment.</p> <p>Data Presentation: The inclusion of tables, figures, and spectra enhances the clarity of the presented data. The results are well-organized, making it easier for readers to interpret the findings.</p> <p>Molecular Characterization: The addition of molecular characterization through FT-IR analyses provides valuable insights into the interaction between aluminum oxyhydroxide and 2,4-DCP, enhancing the scientific depth of the study.</p> <p>Conclusion and Recommendations: The conclusion effectively summarizes the key findings, and the recommendation for further investigation to isolate and characterize the new compound demonstrates a commitment to advancing the understanding of the process.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, with only minor grammatical and stylistic improvements needed for enhanced clarity.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Comparison with Existing Methods: The article briefly mentions other pollution control methods but could benefit from a more in-depth comparison with existing technologies, highlighting the advantages and limitations of the proposed electrocoagulation approach.2. Environmental Implications: Discussion on the environmental implications of the proposed method, including any potential by-products or residues, would add depth to the broader impact of the research.	
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	S. Meenachi
Department, University & Country	K. S. Rangasamy College of Technology, India