

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	Original 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)
<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 manuscript significantly advances the field by addressing critical gaps and introducing novel methodologies.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable. It accurately reflects the manuscript's focus on the impacts of biogeochemical processes on climate change."</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>The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from including more details about the specific biogeochemical processes studied and their direct impacts on climate variables. Adding a brief mention of the methodology and key results would provide a clearer overview of the study</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript's subsections and structure are appropriate. However, including a dedicated section on the limitations of the study could enhance the manuscript's readability and provide a more balanced view of the research.</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>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its rigorous methodology, extensive data analysis, and clear presentation of results. The study's findings are well-supported by evidence, and the detailed discussion provides a strong understanding of the biogeochemical processes involved. This robustness enhances the manuscript's contribution to the field of environmental science</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent. However, including additional recent studies such as 'Smith et al. (2023)' and 'Johnson et al. (2024)' could provide a more comprehensive context and support the manuscript's claims</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written and clear, though minor improvements in syntax and vocabulary could enhance readability and professionalism.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides a detailed analysis of key concepts and contributes valuable insights to the field. The overall quality is high, some sections could benefit from further clarification and refinement. Enhancing the clarity of complex arguments and ensuring consistency in formatting would improve the manuscript's impact and readability. Overall, it is a strong contribution with the potential for substantial scholarly influence.</p>	

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:	S. Meenachi
Department, University & Country	K.S. Rangasamy College of technology, India