

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_119919
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhanced removal of Cr(VI) by PEI/nFe₃O₄ ultrafiltration membranes using peristaltic pump-driven dynamic adsorption
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript was reviewed. The article is well-structured and written in appropriate English language and adds to knowledge and addresses to the readership of the journal. However, I suggest that the authors should address the following comments in the revised paper:</p> <p>.In my opinion, writing a research paper about removal of Cr(VI) by PEI/nFe₃O₄ ultrafiltration membranes is a good topic but different type of methods for removal of chrome such as AOPs, should be introduced in the introduction section along with their advantages and disadvantages. Please describe deeply about this gap and justify this issue. The following manuscript can be cited and be useful in context.</p> <p>The photo degradation of methyl red in aqueous solutions by α-Fe₂O₃/SiO₂ nano photocatalyst The removal of Hexavalent chromium;(Cr (VI)) by ZnO/LECA as a nano photocatalyst using full factorial experimental design, J</p> <p>.The article under consideration appears to be rather simplistic, offering no substantial additional insights beyond existing articles. It is essential for authors to focus on recent developments within the last 3-4 years rather than providing a mere compilation of existing papers. Furthermore, it is expected that research articles are authored by experts in the field, yet the references provided by the authors demonstrate a lack of significant contributions to the subject matter.</p> <p>.All the equations should be in a standard format, numbered and some of them is wrong and should be corrected.</p> <p>.A discussion of challenges that this study overcome and also potential remaining challenges must be conducted in a separate section. Thus following articles are related to your work and can be further analyzed and cited in the manuscript:</p> <p>A sustainable approach in water desalination with the integration of renewable energy sources: Environmental engineering challenges and perspectives</p> <p>Techno-economic assessment of water desalination: Future outlooks and challenges</p> <p>.Research highlights should be representing major outcomes in 3 or 4 bullet points.</p> <p>.The introduction should be rewrite, few researches were performed on the existing gaps in this field should be described, the following papers is related wastewater treatment and can be used and cited at introduction section.</p> <p>Using microwave along with TiO₂ for degradation of 4-chloro-2-nitrophenol in aqueous environment</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Removal of ortho-toluidine from industrial wastewater by UV/TiO2 process Using UV/ZnO process for degradation of Acid red 283 in synthetic wastewater Degradation of 4-Nitrophenol from industrial wastewater by nano catalytic Ozonation</p> <p>7. What is the difference between the study and similar studies, it is not adequately explained. Thus, a comprehensive discussion regarding the novelty of present work compared to other ones and knowledge gaps is suggested.</p> <p>8. It is suggested that the quality and resolution of Figs. enhanced.</p> <p>9. Why the authors have used OFAT instead of DOE for studying variables, the following manuscripts can be used and cited in the text.</p> <p>Treatment of spent caustic wastewater by electro-Fenton process: kinetics and cost analysis Investigation of spent caustic effluent treatment by electro-peroxone process; cost evaluation and kinetic studies</p> <p>10. the repeated sentences should be removed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. It may be appropriate to review all units (such as mg/L or mgL-1) as standard.2. Captions of the figure and tables must be with complete information, conditions etc.3. Please follow the journal's guidelines for the format of materials and method.4. All the equations should be checked once again, they should be both charge and mass balanced,5. Please add the practical applications and future research prospects of this work before the conclusions section.6. Abstract section needs significant modifications in terms of enriching major findings of paper. Abstract of the study must be rewritten to include all essential parts (including numerical expressions). It should clearly state the essence of the problem the authors are addressing, what methodology they adopted, the research outcome, and what was recommended. That will help prospective abstract readers decide whether to read the entire article.7. What is the hypothesis of the study? Please clarify in the introduction. Also, the objective and novelty of the work should be clarified clearly. <p>The purpose and objectives of the research must be clearly stated in the study's introduction. There are too many paragraphs in the introduction. The introduction should consist of five paragraphs answering the following five questions: What is the problem? Why is it interesting and important? Why is it hard? Why hasn't it been solved before? What are the key components of my approach and results?</p>	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aref Shokri
Department, University & Country	Amir Kabir University of Technology, Iran