Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJECC_113200**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Synthesis and characterization of silica nanoparticles derived from tea factory generated wood ash**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

Review Form 1.7

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.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. The manuscript detailing the synthesis of silica nanoparticles from wood ash using the sol-gel technique is important for the scientific community. It addresses the challenge of waste management, offers a sustainable approach to repurposing wood ash, contributes to the understanding of nanoparticle synthesis, and has potential applications in various industries. The study's focus on waste utilization, process optimization, and environmental impact makes it relevant and valuable for researchers and practitioners 2. The title "Synthesis and characterization of silica nanoparticles derived from tea factory generated wood ash" effectively conveys the focus of the article. However, a more concise alternative could be "Sol-Gel Synthesis of Silica Nanoparticles from Tea Factory Wood Ash" to emphasize the specific synthesis method and source of the wood ash. 3. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, covering the background, objectives, methodology, results, and implications. It effectively summarizes the key aspects of the research, including the optimization of parameters, characterization of the synthesized nanoparticles, and the potential for utilization without environmental hazards. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, providing clear delineation of the optimization processes, characterization techniques, and conclusions. The organization allows for easy navigation and understanding of the research methodology and outcomes. 5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the information provided. The methodology aligns with established techniques for nanoparticle synthesis, and the results are supported by characterization methods such as TEM and XRD. However, a more detailed analysis of the experimental methodology and potential sources of error would further validate the scientific rigor of the study. 6. The references provided are relevant and recent, covering a range of topics related to biomass utilization, nanomaterial synthesis, and waste management. However, to further enhance the literature review, additional references related to sol-gel synthesis of silica nanoparticles and waste utilization in the context of tea production could be considered.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	YES	
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)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**JK Bwapwa**
Department, University & Country	**Mangosuthu University of Technology, South Africa**