

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_107679
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis of Mg-doped CuO Nanoparticles for Efficient Removal of Congo Red Dye from Wastewater: Adsorption study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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)
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	<b>Yes!</b> Copper oxide (CuO) nanoparticles (NPs) have shown fascinating behavior in different areas of biomedicine and act as strong bactericidal, catalytic, anti-carcinogenic, and coating agents, and also used to remove dyes from aqueous solutions.	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>It is OK</b>	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Typically an abstract should state briefly the purpose of the study undertaken. However, it requires quantitative data on the optimum result obtained. No Langmuir optimum value, $R^2$ value listed, and necessary result are required in the abstract.	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<b>It is OK!</b> However, materials and methods should be more detailed. Especially section 2, Lines 104 – 118 need more explanation. What about materials and chemicals/reagents applied? Try to re-write materials or chemicals or reagents in the specific amount you have used. Characterization, by which devices name and codes you have characterized etc. try add all this things.	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	The introduction lacks an overview of current research and an emphasis on the objectives of this work. Why adsorption of Congo red using a composite material of <b>Mg-doped CuO Nanoparticles selected</b> , why you did not choose <b>Fe<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/NiO</b> , why did not use only CuO? No detailed discussion under the introduction.	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	All references are recent. Except reference number 4, 7, 8, 12, and 15. Try to change to recent references.	

## Review Form 1.7

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	With a minor revision the manuscript is scientifically correct. As I have commented on the manuscript, all section contains grammatical errors.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The conclusion is not only a summary but puts experimental results and all Figure captions are not clear and not in detail. Try to clearly write a caption of all figures with full information. Under result and discussion no any comparison of your study with previous studies. Try to discuss you result comparatively with previous studies.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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:	<b>Ibsa Neme Mogose</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Addis Ababa Science and Technology University College of Engineering, Ethiopia</b>