

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_95956
Title of the Manuscript:	Kinetic and Thermodynamic Studies of Crude Palm Oil Bleaching using Amansea Clay
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.journalajacr.com/index.php/AJACR/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is an interesting paper from a technical and scientific point of view because it is concerned with the kinetic and thermodynamic study of bleaching crude palm oil using Amansi clay. To be published in the Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research 2. The authors included some qualitative results in the abstract, but they failed with some results, for example, in thermodynamic functions, the units should be ΔG (KJ/mol) ΔH (K J/mol) ΔS (J/mol.K) and make sure From the rest of the values, as well as in Table 12. 3. In the summary, it is also preferable not to mention the method of work related to the activated mud, only mentioning the best results that have been reached. 4. The introduction is good, but it lacks references 5. Adding the original reference for isotherms by Langmuir, Freundlich, and Temkin 6. It is preferable to combine the FT-IR spectra into one format so that you can compare. 7. Combine the SEM images in one figure into one format so that you can compare. 8. The acidity index (pH) is important why it was not taken into account? 9. The study included the Temkin model, so it is necessary to include isotherm charts to prove this. 10. Different characterizations should be provided in the current study, such as BET spectra, to know the surface area and the comparison between raw clay and activated clay. 11. A comparative study through a literature survey reinforces the manuscript. 12. The optimal conditions must be mentioned in each form 13. All references used in the manuscript are recent, and this is positive evidence of its success. 14. Adding the original reference to the kinetic study, both pseudo-first and pseudo-second-rank. 15. In the time of equilibrium, why is the communication time short if the range (10-180) minutes is better? 16. The amount of adsorbent was very high, why was it not studied less than 1g, on the other hand, the weight of 7g was the highest weight which is supposed to be the highest efficiency! 17. Suggest you some additional references to enhance the manuscript https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13399-022-03091-y https://www.annalsofscb.ro/index.php/journal/article/view/7945 	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahmood A. Albo Hay Allah
Department, University & Country	Iraq