

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_113255
Title of the Manuscript:	Adsorption Investigations on the Removal of Azoic Dye by Untreated Wood Sawdust
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it applies certain concepts of the circular economy and principles of green chemical engineering to address an environmental pollution issue. Both the summary and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, and the references provided are sufficient. However, the authors need to address the following observations so that the manuscript can be scientifically accurate:</p> <p>1. It is not clear what the purpose of the EDX analysis was. The authors should explain how the results of these analyses relate to the adsorption capacity of the Congo network on the surface of the adsorbent. Likewise, they must explain the relevance of finding traces of calcium and copper.</p> <p>2. Section 3.1.4 seems to be incomplete, or in any case, it does not make sense to write the BET equation and describe its components.</p> <p>3. The font size changes from one section to another.</p> <p>4. In Figure 6 what are the "ppm"? Likewise, equilibrium is reached long before the 50 minutes indicated by the authors.</p> <p>5. It is not understood what the purpose of Figure 11 is. From my point of view, it is not necessary.</p> <p>6. I consider that the fits of the experimental data with the Freundlich and pseudo 2 order models should be shown graphically, since it is not enough to indicate the value of R² to confirm the fit of the experimental data with the proposed models.</p> <p>7. The conclusions should go into greater detail regarding the results obtained in the characterization of the materials.</p>	1- EDX analysis confirm and support the (FT-IR) spectral results. 2- It is complete, only the surface area and the average pore size is calculated. 3- Done. 4- Corrected and highlighted by the yellow colour. 5- In Figure 11 the results of Tables 2 & 3 are shown graphically, so it will be better not to remove Figure 11 from the text. 6- The result is mentioned in table 4. 7- DONE.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	I do not fully agree with the reviewer's comment. The authors corrected it and highlighted it in yellow because they agreed on some points with the reviewer.