

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_95867
Title of the Manuscript:	Treatment of Textile Dyeing Effluent Using Agriculture Waste Based Adsorbents - A Review
Type of the Article	Review

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.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Yes 3. No 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. Yes <p>Comments to the Author:</p> <p>Please consider the following suggestions below for the improvement of your manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The main objective of the work must be written on the more clear and more concise way at the end of introduction section. 2. Introduction section must be written on more quality way, i.e. more up-to-date references addressed. Research gap should be delivered on more clear way with directed necessity for the conducted research work. 3. Conclusion section is missing some perspective related to the future research work, quantify main research findings. 4. Check the whole manuscript properly to find out and correct the grammatical error and improve the writing. 5. Reconstruct the sentences of the manuscript properly. Sentence framing is not up to the mark. 6. Rewrite the abstract, Maximum limit of abstract is 200 to 250 words for an article. 7. The reasoning of the discussion section should be stronger. Please try to enhance the reasoning by adding more information from the recent literature. 8. Avoid the unnecessary capitalization of words. 9. Define the abbreviation at its first use. 10. The authors should check the format of subtitles throughout the paper. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>11. Reference format should be checked.</p> <p>12. Table format and citations in the text should be checked.</p> <p>13. The authors should mention the notations used in the paper should be given as nomenclature.</p> <p>14. The general statements like lot of investigations are carried out may be avoided and should be indicated with references.</p> <p>15. Authors should spell check throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>16. Check the spaces between units throughout the text. As per the format it should be modified.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English must be checked throughout the manuscript. Poorly written.	
Optional/General comments	Over all, in my point of view, the work may contain some outputs. All the above comments can be followed and authors can improve the quality of their manuscript so that it would be considered for publication in this renowned journal.	

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:	M. Naveenkumar
Department, University & Country	Easwari Engineering College, India