Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IRJPAC_111496**
Title of the Manuscript:	**OPTIMIZATION OF ETHYLENE GLYCOL PRODUCTION PROCESS FROM BIO MASS (CORN COB) USING RESPONSE SURFACE METHODOLOGY (RSM)**
Type of the Article	**Original article/Research article**

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journalirjpac.com/index.php/IRJPAC/editorial-policy)

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)**	**YES** **YES** **YES** **YES** **CORRECT** **Sufficient but author has to quoted recent references.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	YES	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript discuses the optimization of monoethylene glycol (MEG) production from corncob biomass through catalytic hydrogenation. It explores the use of response surface methodology (RSM) and a second order polynomial equation to optimize the process parameters on MEG yield. But the manuscript lacks detailed information on the specific experimental procedures and the characterization of the produced MEG. Additionally, it could benefit from a more comprehensive discussion of the limitations and challenges encountered during the optimization process. Furthermore, the document does not provide a thorough comparison with existing literature or alternative methods for MEG production. Overall, the manuscript provides valuable insights into the suitable production of MEG from lignocellulosic biomass.	

Review Form 1.7

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ramalingappa**
Department, University & Country	**Davangere University, India**