

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_113971
Title of the Manuscript:	Production and Characterization of Silica from Rice Husk: An Updated Review
Type of the Article	Review 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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? 2. Is the title of the article suitable? 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. The abstract could be more concise while still providing a clear overview of the key points discussed in the article. Consider summarizing the main findings and contributions in a more succinct manner. 2. The introduction provides a good background on rice husk and its potential as a source of silica. However, it could benefit from a more structured approach, clearly outlining the objectives and scope of the review. 3. Consider breaking down the introduction into subsections to provide a clearer roadmap for the reader. 4. The section on methods for production of silica is informative, but the presentation could be improved for better readability. 5. Properties and Characterization: This section provides a thorough overview of various characterization techniques used for silica. However, it could be streamlined by providing a brief overview of each technique followed by specific examples or applications to rice husk silica. 6. The application section provides valuable insights into the diverse uses of rice husk silica. However, it could be enhanced by organizing the information into categories (e.g., industrial applications, environmental applications, biomedical applications) for better clarity. 7. Additionally, providing specific examples or case studies of successful applications could make this section more impactful. 8. The conclusion should summarize the key findings of the review and emphasize the significance of the research presented. Consider reiterating the main contributions of the review and suggesting potential avenues for future research in this field. 9. Review the language throughout the article for clarity, consistency, and grammatical correctness. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Review the language throughout the article for clarity, consistency, and grammatical correctness.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into the production and characterization of silica from rice husk, addressing an important aspect of waste utilization and resource sustainability.</p> <p>The title "Production and Characterization of Silica from Rice Husk: An Updated Review" effectively captures the focus of the article.</p> <p>The abstract could be more concise while still providing a clear overview of the key points discussed in the article.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, providing a clear organization of the content. However, some sections could benefit from further delineation or restructuring to improve readability and flow.</p> <p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, with thorough discussions supported by relevant literature and references.</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:	S. Meenachi
Department, University & Country	K S Rangasamy College of Technology, India