

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Chemical Science International Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CSIJ_96282</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Characterization of Coal Combustion Residues using Transmission Electron Microscopy Technique</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://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><b>Compulsory</b> 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 thereview form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This manuscript good study, while including some problem in writing and concept design. After correct these important documents IS possible to recommend to publication. Please check these comments:</p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>yes</b></p> <p>Including some problem in writing and concept design</p> <p>this part is not good</p> <p>Not accepted please add some ref.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>This manuscript good study, while including some problem in writing and concept design. After correct these important documents IS possible to recommend to publication. Please check these comments:</p> <p>1. What progress against the most recent state-of-the-art similar studies was made?</p> <p>2. The innovation and the importance of this work are not clearly highlighted in the introduction and conclusions. Please work on this and prove to us why this work isvaluable.</p> <p>3. Authors should present technology for your study. This should more clearly show the knowledge gaps identified and link them to the paper goals. A high-quality paper has to provide a proper state of the art analysis after the literature review and only based on the analysis to formulate the paper goals. The lack of proper justification creates the wrong impression that the authors are unaware of the recent developments.</p> <p>4. Please add these Ref. about this study1) DOI 10.1088/2053-1591/ab4af8 2) <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/s11082-022-04203-8">https://doi.org/10.1007/s11082-022-04203-8</a></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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</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>Mazin Sherzad Othman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Soran University, Iraq</b>