

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_97609
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization and modelling of cyanide removal from cassava waste water using calcined and activated adsorbent mixtures of oyster shell and periwinkle shell ash
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://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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>Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community, since it deals with the separation of toxic contaminant cyanide using bio adsorbents.</p> <p>Yes, title is suitable.</p> <p>Yes comprehensive</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language should be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The abstract looks lengthy. The authors are recommended to give quantitative results of major findings only in the abstract.</p> <p>2. In the abstract, the value of pH need not have to be given with three decimal places. The unit of contact time could be mentioned as min.</p> <p>3. In the materials and methods, the description about RSM is missing.</p> <p>4. The characterization of adsorbent is not sufficient. The authors could try with SEM, EDX, FTIR, XRD analysis.</p> <p>5. Results and discussion chapter is too thin, and it has to be more elaborate. This chapter has to be rewritten.</p> <p>6. Fig. 6 F to O does not show any significant impact of variables on the responses. Authors are requested to address this.</p> <p>7. In table 1, initial concentration of cyanide is missing.</p> <p>8. Conclusion chapter has to be improved.</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	E. Kavitha
Department, University & Country	SRM Institute of Science and Technology, India