

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_113408
Title of the Manuscript:	PREPARATION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF ACTIVATED CARBON FROM MELON SEED HUSK
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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript) The subject of activated carbon synthesis and identification of their physical and chemical properties is one of the topics of interest to scientists and engineers in environmental pollution treatment.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title) The title of the article is appropriate</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract of the article well represents the text of the article.</p> <p>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections and structure of the manuscript are well written.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically sound? The manuscript is scientifically correct, but in my opinion, this research is weak and limited compared to similar researches</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and new? If you have any suggestions for additional references, please do so in the review form. References are old.</p> <p>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. In my opinion, the writing quality of the article is low and there are spelling mistakes in the article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Thanks to the authors of the article. This research is about the preparation of carbon active from the peel of melon seeds by the method of direct heating in the oven. Then the components of the product have been determined. In my opinion, this article is not particularly innovative. Many articles have been published about the synthesis of carbon active from the peel of melon seeds and detailed investigations such as TGA, BET, SEM, TEM, etc. have been carried out on the product and its various applications in water purification, absorption of air pollutants, etc. has been. At the same time, more advanced methods have been used for synthesis and have been compared with the direct heating method in the furnace. Due to the oldness of the subject, old references and many spelling mistakes in the article. This article is rejected in my opinion</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:	Saeid Jamehbozorgi
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran