

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_96311
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality Analysis Activated Carbon of from Bituminous Coal as the Primary Battery Cathode Potential Using Fluoric Acid
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://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 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>Yes, every research is important for future well-being. This research is one of the important manuscripts to be shared with public community.</p> <p>Acceptable title.</p> <p>Acceptable abstract.</p> <p>Subsection required standardize formatting.</p> <p>Yes, it is genuine project.</p> <p>Take a look on the references. I found many listed references was not cited in the article. It shall be removed from the list if references.</p> <p>This manuscript required proofreading services. To many mistake in formatting and most of the are not standardized.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Acceptable language. It was understandable.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mohd Amirul Syafiq Mohd Yunos
Department, University & Country	Malaysia