

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_118402
Title of the Manuscript:	EXTRACTION OF ALUMINA FROM KAOLIN FOUND IN GEM MINING SITES OF SRI LANKA
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is important to the scientific community because it points towards a new method of extracting alumina from the kaolin clay found at gem mining sites, which could add commercial value to otherwise wasted resources and mitigate environmental impacts. 2. The title is suitable as it clearly states the focus of the study. 3. The abstract is comprehensive and summarizes the objectives, methods, results, and conclusion effectively. However, ensure it highlights the novelty and significance of the findings more explicitly. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, following a logical flow from introduction to conclusion. Each section is clearly defined and contributes to the overall narrative of the research. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is robust, and the results are clearly presented and discussed. The use of XRF, XRD, FTIR, and SEM analyses provides strong support for the findings. 6. The references are sufficient and recent. However, ensure that all cited works are relevant and directly support the research. You may also suggest adding any seminal or recent works that could strengthen the literature review. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, though some minor grammatical corrections and improvements in phrasing could enhance clarity.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There do not appear to be any ethical issues in this manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marie Constance Beavogui
Department, University & Country	Higher Institute of Mines and Geology of Boke, Guinea