

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_126721
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterisation of Coconut Shell, Coconut Shell Biochar, Coconut Coir, and Coconut Shell Activated Carbon as Potential Adsorbent Materials: A Comparative Study
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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 manuscript is important for the scientific community because of it's green approach using biomass	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not suitable. Proximate, FTIR, and SEM Characterization of Coconut Biomass	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Structure of the manuscript is 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.	It followed scientific approach in characterizing synthesized materials	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are in order	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	English and communication in the manuscript is scholarly	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Spectroscopic Characterization of the samples are limited. More would have been better. FTIR and SEM are not representative. I will advise doing XRD on the samples	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	John Godwin
Department, University & Country	Kogi State College of Education, Nigeria