

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	The type of research is Experimental.

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. Suggest an alternative title: Calcium oxide obtained from the calcination of mollusk shell waste. 2. The summary of the article addresses the elements that this element must contain, however, in the methodological part described in the summary and also in the methodology of the work, it is missing to present the chemical and mineralogical characterization of the waste used to demonstrate the importance of the proposed use based on the chemical composition- mineralogy of the same. These would be fundamental data to be added to the work to justify the efficiency of the research proposed. 3. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are incomplete and need to add the chemical-mineralogical composition of the waste to support the discussion of the effectiveness of calcination of the waste used. Well, it brings a more robust argument to justify the calcination temperature. Not just based on the citation of works that bring this composition. 4. Most of the references are not recent. The most current is from 2020, showing a deficiency of four years. Therefore, it is interesting to update and increase the number of references. 5. The suggestion is to add the chemical-mineralogical composition of the residue used (natural and after being calcined at each temperature - comparing the results obtained) to make the work robust and improve arguments about the efficiency of the process used. You must update the references, using 2022 to 2024 (from the last three years). Improve conclusions. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The suggestion is to add the chemical-mineralogical composition of the residue used (natural and after being calcined at each temperature - comparing the results obtained) to make the work robust and improve arguments about the efficiency of the process used. You must update the references, using 2022 to 2024 (from the last three years). Improve conclusions.</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:	Samea Valensca Alves Barros
Department, University & Country	Federal Rural University of Semi-Arid, Brazil