Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJACR_99870**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Photocatalytic Decomposition of Methylene Blue over Nanosized Ca^{2+} Doped $LaMnO_3$ under Visible Light Irradiation**
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.journalajacr.com/index.php/AJACR/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)*
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)**	**Compulsory** REVISION comments **1. The work provides a new a ease synthesis route of Ca^{2+} Doped $LaMnO_3$. The manuscript also provides a clear background why $LaMnO_3$ should be altered with another heteroatoms. Moreover, the performance of the catalyst followed such route can be deemed as a valuable reference.** **2. The title of the manuscript is acceptable** **3. The abstract of the study fully covers and highlights the content of the work.** **4. The structure of the manuscript is highly logical; however, the methodology section should be split into smaller section for better navigation** **5. The manuscript is scientifically correct** **6. The references are sufficiently provided; however, a lot of them are outdated so newer one should be used** **7. The authors should recheck the name of the method used for the synthesis of Ca^{2+} doped $LaMnO_3$.** **8. The author should provide the version of the program used for XRD patterns analysis** **9. The crystallographic data of pristine $LaMnO_3$ should also be provided for the comparison between $LaMnO_3$ and the Ca^{2+} doped one.** **10. SEM images can be used to observe the porous structure on the surficial level. In order to provide the explanation for the adsorptive properties of the material, N_2 adsorption and desorption isotherm should be provided. If not the author should identify which shape of the perovskite $LaMnO_3$ is taking** **11. The authors should explain more on "peaks at 1033.42 cm^{-1} and 1060.90 cm^{-1} are due to presence of little carbonates in the sample".** **12. The authors need to explain more on the reason why there is a decrease of the band gap of the material instead of reporting solely on the reduction of the bandgap of the material.** **13. The photocatalytic degradation of MB using the nano-perovskite and its corresponding kinetic study should be redone due to its low regression coefficient as it has been repeatedly reported that degradation of organic compound via photocatalysis follows pseudo first-order model with a high regression coefficient.** **14. The authors mentioned the adsorption properties of the materials, however, such data is not provided in the manuscript**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**1. The English quality of the article is highly suitable for scholarly communications**	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Nguyen Huu Hieu**
Department, University & Country	**Ho Chi Minh University of Technology, Vietnam National University, Vietnam**