

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_110442
Title of the Manuscript:	RECYCLING OF LOCAL PHOSPHATE WASTE - MINERALIZED MASS INTO ACTIVATED PHOSPHORUS FERTILIZERS
Type of the Article	

### 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. I think every scientific work will have influence and importance for community, especially those are relevant with recent situation.</p> <p>Reviewer suggest the title can be more specific and emphasize on certain technology used in obtaining activated phosphorus fertilizer in this research.</p> <p>It is comprehensive enough and have represented result of research conducted.</p> <p>Reviewer suggest author to improve the data presentation to be more friendly read (easy to comprehend) for more effective information delivery to readers.</p> <p>Reviewer found the manuscript still lack of scientific references for each result provided and explained in it, that this may decrease the validity of result and conclusion drawn.</p> <p>References are not sufficient as described in no.5 and not quite recent. Less than 75% of references are below 10 years.</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>The quality of language need improvement. Some sentences are not Grammarly correct while most of its explanation are difficult to digest and thus it doesn't deliver information smoothly to readers.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Theresia EPS Rahayu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Cilacap State of Polytechnic, Indonesia</b>