

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_121028
Title of the Manuscript:	Photocatalytic degradation of methylene blue and methyl orange dyes using transition metal-doped titanium dioxide nanoparticles
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This is a review article so author should have to use scientific terms not we, they etc.</p> <p>The author should have to add some numerical values in abstract.</p> <p>The equation 2, 3, 4 Should be written properly in Mathematica or in any suitable software dot the author should add some up-to-date data enter</p> <p>According to figure 2 the author should have to provide details on various points like (ionic, nonionic synthetic acidic) etc.</p> <p>In photocatalytic reaction using TiO₂ portion there are many writing mistakes.</p> <p>There are a lot of writing mistakes in manuscript like subscript values superscript values</p> <p>In figure 19 the figure of SEM should be more cleared and same for all figures.</p> <p>Author should have to add applications of the reviewed particles</p> <p>The author should add a comparison between all nanoparticles</p> <p>The author should have to add suggestion for future prospectus</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Photocatalytic degradation of methylene blue and methyl orange dyes using transition metal-doped titanium dioxide nanoparticles: applications</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>No it should be improved. I suggest addition</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>No there is no difference between section and subsection.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Please first row</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>It's okay</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Major revision	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Muhammad Danish Ali
Department, University & Country	Silesian University of Technology, Poland