

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_115178
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficiency of Shell Waste as a Source of Calcium Carbonate to Produce Calcium Oxide Through Calcination Process
Type of the Article	

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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"> The manuscript appears to be valuable to the scientific community, providing insights on how to more efficiently harness natural resources while promoting sustainable practices and technological innovation. The title "Efficiency of Shell Waste as a Source of Calcium Carbonate to Produce Calcium Oxide Through Calcination Process" is suitable as it clearly indicates the focus of the study: evaluating the effectiveness of using shell waste to produce calcium oxide via calcination. It succinctly communicates the main topic and methodology of the research. Overall, the abstract seems to provide a clear and concise summary of the research, covering the aim, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, it could be enhanced by including numerical values or ranges for the efficiency percentages (e.g., "The average efficiency of CaO compounds at 800°C is 61.85% ± X%"). Additionally, it could briefly mention the significance or implications of the findings. The manuscript appears to have a clear structure with appropriate subsections, which enhances readability and organization. Here's an evaluation of the subsections and structure. Experimental Procedures: The methods for preparation and calcination of mollusk shells are described clearly and in detail, ensuring the replicability of the experiment. <p>Data Analysis Methods: The analysis of the efficiency of calcined samples is conducted based on the mass variation before and after calcination, allowing for a quantitative assessment of the results.</p> <p>Potential Study Limitations: Potential limitations are identified, such as sample variations, control of calcination temperature, and analysis of sample efficiency, highlighting areas that may affect the interpretation of results. The references provided offer a diverse range of sources relevant to the study's topic, covering aspects such as shell waste utilization, calcium extraction methods, and calcination processes. However, it's important to consider the recency and adequacy of these references for supporting the study's findings. Here's an evaluation:</p> <p>Recency: Some of the references cited appear to be recent, such as references [1], [3], [4], [8], [11], and [12], which are from the past few years. However, there are also references from earlier years, such as [6], [7], [9], and [10], which may not capture the most up-to-date advancements or methodologies in the field.</p> <p>Adequacy: While the references cover a broad spectrum of relevant topics, including calcium extraction techniques and calcination processes, it's essential to ensure that they directly support the specific methods and findings of the study. For instance, references [1], [3], and [4] appear to focus on shell waste utilization and calcium extraction, aligning well with the study's objectives. However, some references, such as [11] and [12], may not directly relate to the study's focus on shell waste calcination. </p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly 	<p>Overall, the language and English quality of the article meet the standards expected for scholarly communications. However, careful proofreading and editing may be necessary to address any minor issues in grammar, style, or referencing to enhance the article's clarity and professionalism</p>	

Review Form 1.7

communications?	further.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the article presents a significant contribution to the scientific literature, addressing a relevant problem and providing important insights into the utilization of crustacean waste in the production of calcium oxide. Some suggested improvements include updating the references and including additional details on the analysis techniques used.	

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:	Elissando Rocha Da Silva
Department, University & Country	Brazil