

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_95837
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of faecal sludge in the Oueme delta
Type of the 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.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	To some what it needs some major modifications Yes, The abstract and conclusion should be modified to give more insights into the work. To some what It needs a major modification. You should add more statistical analysis to add more value to the results and the discussion. The reference section is extremely abstracted: You should add these references to enhance the literature review section: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2022.3189770.• https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2022.118134.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	A revision is needed.	
Optional/General comments	None	

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:	Mahmoud Owais
Department, University & Country	Assiut University, Egypt