

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_97825
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance Evaluation of Modified Periwinkle Shell–Derived Adsorbent for CO2 Post-Combustion Capture
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>)

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	Yes, the manuscript describes a very important aspect in the carbon capture.	
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)	Yes No, can be improved Yes, but can be improved. Yes Yes The manuscript describes a very important topic which I believe will be of interest to the readers. I have identified the following errors and queries which needs to be corrected and addressed. Please refer to the manuscript for other minor corrections. I suggest that the authors re-write the abstract. Please note that the abstract represents a summary of the most striking features and the results in this study. Provide a brief discussion of the other pictures in figure 2 i.e. a, b, and c. Briefly explain why the FTIR spectra in Figure 3 looks similar? Show the region of the stretching frequency corresponding to those functional group. The conclusion is a better summary which can be included in the abstract.	
Minor REVISION comments	Language needs be revised	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Optional/General comments		

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:	Trevor Chiweshe
Department, University & Country	Institute for Groundwater Studies, University of the Free State, South Africa