

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Applied Chemistry Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJACR_124420
Title of the Manuscript:	XRD Studies on Metamorphic Changes of the Dissimilarly Graphitized Carbonaceous Materials
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is very correct as it brings out a good scientific invention. Summarise conclusion as per the objectives and not from literature review example the first paragraph of the conclusion is not specific and straight forward. Tie the laboratory results with the objectives. Kindly include recommendation for this scientific study. Please list the specific company where activated carbon and carbon Blakes were procured, and the exact time of sampling and the type of sampling used. Are there sample pretreatment methods that were done to the activated carbon.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No, the abstract need to give a short summary of the research which is not the case in this. The author should indicate the research gap that is being filled by this research, methodology used, results, conclusion and recommendation in the abstract, which is not the case here. The abstract need to be restructured afresh.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author needs to bring out the justification and the problem statement of the research in the introduction part which does not come clear on my side.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No. The researcher should add reference for other scientific inventions that are used to build this research in the introduction part and the result analysis and discussion part.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The author should be referencing works that are not his/her invasion	
Optional/General comments	The instrumental of analysis the author should include the country of origin.	

Review Form 3

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:	Calvince Ochieng Ondijo
Department, University & Country	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya