

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_112128
Title of the Manuscript:	SYNTHESIS AND CHARACTERIZATION OF CRAB SHELL BASED MAGNETIC NANOPARTICLES FOR THE REMEDIATION OF ABATTOIR WASTE WATERS
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The problem of waste water remediation is actual for the modern world, the ways of its solution developed and described in the manuscript are valuable. Therefore the manuscript is important for scientific community 2. The present title of the article is suitable but needs more data of nanoparticles characteristics to be added to the results. Or an alternative title can be given to the current form of the manuscript: THE REMEDIATION OF ABATTOIR WASTE WATERS WITH CRAB SHELL BASED MAGNETIC NANOPARTICLES 3. The abstract is comprehensive 4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate 5. Data given in the Table 3 should be expressed as $M \pm m$, number of experiments must be given to be scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient and recent. At the same time all references should be listed in the end of the article. Links to the references should be given in a similar way through the text – References (Sibiya et al., 2022; Kristianto et al., 2020) given on the page 5 of the manuscript - Sibiya et al., 2022 is absent in the list of references, must be added to the list, then be replaced with square brackets with corresponding numbers (Kristianto et al., 2020; Ohale et al., 2020) page 7- must be replaced with square brackets with corresponding numbers (Coutts, 2008) page 7 - must be added to the list of references, then be replaced with square brackets with corresponding number <p>Additional comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) The literature review should be supplemented with additional information as to crab shell or chitin or chitosan use in waste water treatment b) Some scientific terms are incorrect (may be due to mistyping) – corrections must be done (examples: ferion indicator – possibly, it is ferrion; 65C, 1500C, 80C – the degree symbol must be added; mins - “minutes” becomes “min,” with both singular and plural numbers; physiochemical – must be replaced by physicochemical) c) All abbreviation used in the text should be clarified – e.g. MCSNP on the page 5 d) some my comments are added to the text marked with blue colour 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Article needs the very serious language revision (I marked mistakes and typos with yellow colour in the manuscript): Examples: nano particles was utilized (should be were, should be nanoparticles), Turbidity and color (low case “t”), turbidity and colour (please, choose one version and use through all the text of the manuscript), respectively (comma is absent before the word “respectively”)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Natalia Trufanova
Department, University & Country	The Institute for the Problems of Cryobiology and Cryomedicine of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Ukraine