

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_95448
Title of the Manuscript:	Ceramic Water Filters Impregnated with Silver Nanoparticles for the Removal of Lead and Chromium Ions from Water
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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Paper describes with a lot of details how obtain two types of ceramic filters impregnated with Ag-nano particles, and their possibilities of use to treat waters which have relevant amounts of Pb and Cr. Results are very promising. In this way I think that paper is important for scientific and technical community.</p> <p>2. Title of article is suitable. No changes.</p> <p>3. Abstract is comprehensive taking into account the following: (i) authors justify the opportunity of investigations based on <i>The high cost and complexity of existing techniques used to remove heavy metal ions from water</i>; (ii) they explain the different types of filters used in study; (iii) abstract summarize all the experiences carried out and results and treatment yielding obtained (ceramic filters, dip-soaped filters, paint filters, and experiments with temperature). Finally, is important the final paragraph which indicates <i>ceramic water filters impregnated with silver nanoparticles offer a practical, low-cost, and socially acceptable alternative for removing heavy metal ions from water at the household level.</i></p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of manuscript are appropriate. I want to highlight the sound revision of methods used to remove metals in water included in the Introduction section, as well as the thoroughness in the description of fabrication of ceramic filters impregnated with Ag nano particles included in the Materials and Methods section.</p> <p>5. I think that manuscript is scientifically correct, results are clearly expressed, discussion is solid and conclusions are consistent.</p> <p>6. Authors present 23 references of the different items considered in paper. Nevertheless, authors could consider the inclusion of any new referenced intended about presence and behaviour of metals in waters, as for example, the following: <i>Occurrence of metals in waters: An overview, Marín Galvín, R, (1996) Water SA., 22 (1) 7-18.</i></p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I think that language of the article is totally suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	In my opinion the paper is very interesting to aid solving the problems of toxicity derived from potential consumption of waters rich in Pb and Cr. Authors must revise the treatment yielding obtained with the dip-soaked filters respect to Cr (this question is highlighted in yellow in the version of paper send to editor.	

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:	Rafael Marín Galvín
Department, University & Country	University of Cordoba, Spain