

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_105919
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Carbon Synthesis of Peat Using ZnCl₂ and H₃PO₄ for Heavy Metal Adsorption in Oilfield Produced Water
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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>The manuscript is important for the scientific community</p> <p>Remove the word comparative from the title.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Improvement be done in methodology its too summarised missing out very many information out The manuscript is somehow not correct but if optimisation is done, it will be very correct to justify our conclusion</p> <p>The references are not sufficient since a whole paragraph can miss a single citation. This should be improved before the paper is accepted.</p> <p>How was the sample transported to the laboratory? How much of the samples were collected? What sample parameters were taken and recorded in the field? List of equipments and reagents used missing. Season of sampling missing. Include the country of origin to all machines used in analysis The research should justify why the adsorption experiments were done at chosen conditions without optimization The researcher should improve on citing works that do not belong to him/her The researcher should fit the data to test adsorption isotherms/kinetics Justification of the study should be improved in the introduction part why the research was done and why in the chosen locality ? Label the diagrams in ways that communicate not as abcd...</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to be improved before publication i.e tenses and scientific language	
Optional/General comments	The researcher should improve on the tenses in reporting work already done. It should be in past tense	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Calvince Ochieng Ondijo
Department, University & Country	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya