

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_121078
Title of the Manuscript:	Kinetics And Equilibrium Studies Of The Detoxification Of Aqueous Solutions Of Phenolic Derivatives Using Activated Carbon
Type of the Article	Research article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The today's era of waste water management is increasing and more in demand. Such toxic materials have to be removed from the waste water and more cost-effective research is needed in this area.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is fine and acceptable. But author has not brought the impact of equilibrium studies and the word detoxification used in the title.	
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.	Results must be clearly given in the abstract with justification and scope of study	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Paper is made too lengthy. The results of the both types of phenol can be clubbed and rewritten The graphs are they plotted in excel or origin. They are totally looking different.	
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.	Though the topic chosen is the need of the area for protecting the environment, author has to clearly write the paper as a research article, it is been more written as a project report.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	References can be added still. No were in the result and its discussion the references are coated.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No paper needs English correction or reconsideration in writing the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Lokeshwari Navalgund
Department, University & Country	SDMCET, India