

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Chemical Science International Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_CSIJ_99466 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The Removal of Sulfamonomethoxine (SMM) with Copper oxide/Zirconium dioxide (CuO/ZrO ₂) Nanocomposites by Photocatalytic Degradation in Pharmaceutical Industry Wastewaters and the Evaluation of Microtox (<i>Aliivibrio fischeri</i>) and <i>Daphnia magna</i> Acute Toxicity Assays |
| 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>)

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) | Yes Yes 0 Yes. But the abstract is too lengthy. It should be rewritten within 300-400 words. Yes Yes Number of references should be reduced and should be written in right format as per the requirement of the journal. The paper is too lengthy and exhaustive seems as if like a thesis. The 38 pages work should be limited to 20 pages. | |
| Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | There are some grammatical errors which must be taken care of. | |
| 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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Himansulal Nayak |
| Department, University & Country | Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology, India |