

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_126570
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficiency of ZnO Nanoparticles and Various Additives on Sonodegradation of Methylene Blue
Type of the 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>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative 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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The work is focused on degradation of MB dye using sonochemical approach. The work is executed well, however more clarification and changes are required before considering for the publication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The present work seems like results or data, no proper attribution is there for the same. • Many places, scientific units and symbols are written in an appropriate manner, correct throughout the manuscript. • The title is not suitable because the present work is comparative work. Keep suitable title • However, the mechanism and efficiency of ZnO cannot be compared with NaCl, Na₂SO₄ or H₂O₂ under sonochemistry. • Some more analytical supports required for the confirmation of obtained results. • As a representative, degradation performance with the UV spectroscopy should be included with the calculation of % degradation. Also, linearity curve needed. • Revise the experimental section with more clarity. • Include, related more photocatalysis reports to enhance the readability 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Tarun Parangi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Sardar Patel University, India</p>