

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JMSRR_100668</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Natural Materials for Water Purification: A Review</b>
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://journaljmsrr.com/index.php/JMSRR/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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is important, the research database refers to current assumptions, but in the introductory account it mentions up to the year 2010 and some references to 2018 and 2017.</p> <p>No, somewhat evidencing the problem of water in all the research and not preferring to mention the problem of "Natural Materials" or even giving details of the benefits widely, makes it intransient.</p> <p>The summary is good, tentative and suggestive.</p> <p>Yes, but not those that are involved in the specific problem of Nigeria. It is assumed that the manuscript reflects the global problem, but does not specify location.</p> <p>I believe that there are things that can be improved, the resolution and presentation of alternatives is detailed, but the introductory part must be improved to date.</p> <p>Yeah, I suggest a modification of the introductory part and the approach to the problem, in addition to mentioning that the details of its stated objectives. it is proposed that the database should be 3 to 4 years old. It is important that it does not involve specific places like Nigeria, if you are talking about a global problem you can refer to specific continents with current or recent amounts and data. the information is irrelevant if we talk about meetings that took place in 1997, to date there are 26 years of changes and updates.</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes, the grammar is very good and understandable.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Yulissa Eveliz Palomino Seguil</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Continental, Perú</b>