

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Chemical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_127339
Title of the Manuscript:	Fabrication of ZrO <sub>2</sub> Coating For Highly Solid Phase Microextraction of Benzotriazole Ultraviolet Filters in different water samples
Type of the 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>

#### 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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The paper contains several grammatical errors and typos (e.g., "solid phase microextraction" instead of "solid phase microextraction"). A thorough proofreading or professional language editing is needed to enhance clarity and professionalism.</li> <li>The experimental section lacks details on the rationale behind selecting specific parameters (e.g., CV cycles and NaCl concentration). Including explanations for these choices would enhance the reproducibility and scientific rigor of the study.</li> <li>Figures and tables are informative but need better alignment and professional formatting. For example, the chromatograms in Figure 3 should have clearer labels, and Table 2's units (e.g., "g/L") should be consistent with the rest of the paper</li> <li>The discussion on the fiber's selective affinity for BUFs is insufficient. Elaborating on the chemical interactions between ZrO<sub>2</sub> and BUFs would better justify the observed selectivity and highlight the advantages of the proposed method over existing alternatives.</li> </ol>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is informative but overly long and slightly unclear. Consider simplifying it to: "Development of ZrO <sub>2</sub> -Coated SPME Fibers for Detecting Benzotriazole Ultraviolet Filters in Water Samples."	
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.		

### Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the language quality of the article is not yet suitable for scholarly communication. Below are the main issues identified and suggestions for improvement:</p> <p>Issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Typographical Errors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Words like "microextraction" instead of "microextraction" and "exellent" instead of "excellent" are frequent and need correction.</li> <li>○ Inconsistent capitalization, such as "BUvFs" and "UV flters," diminishes professionalism.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Grammatical Mistakes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Incorrect sentence structures, such as "due to its imple, rapid, practical and effective sample preparation technology," require revision for clarity.</li> <li>○ Phrases like "some BUvFs have endocrine disrupting and estrogenic effects" lack proper grammar.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. Awkward and Redundant Phrasing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sentences like "the excessive use of them is limited in some countries and regions" are awkward and could be rephrased for better readability (e.g., "their excessive use is restricted in certain countries and regions").</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. Inconsistency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Units such as "g/L" and "µg/L" are not uniformly presented, and abbreviations are not always defined upon first use.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

#### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	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>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><b>C.Rajababu</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Annamacharya University, India</b></p>