

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_121724
Title of the Manuscript:	SOLVENT EXTRACTION OF ZINC FROM BURNT TYRE ASH USING TRI BUTYL PHOSPHATE
Type of the Article	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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The researcher aims to address the issue of high zinc concentrations found in tire waste by exploring alternative methods for zinc extraction using a simple solvent extraction process. This approach is intended to mitigate the environmental hazards associated with zinc contamination.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract can be improved by adding the problem statement and results & discussion.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please use a subscript for numbers in chemical formulas, such as $ZnCO_3$, and revise the entire manuscript accordingly. 2. Remove the sections 1.1-1.3. The introduction section can be shortened and made more precise by focusing specifically on the solvent extraction of zinc from burnt tyre ash using tri-n-butyl phosphate. 3. The manuscript appears to be written in a thesis format rather than that of a journal article, indicating that the authors did not fully prepare it for journal submission. 4. Please use superscripts for numbers in standard unit measurements, such as cm^3, and revise the entire manuscript accordingly. 5. The presentation of the results in the table and graph needs improvement for better clarity and readability. Specifically, some of the data lacks unit measurements for the extraction yield, making it difficult to interpret. Additionally, the overall layout and formatting should be adjusted to enhance comprehension and ensure that the information is easily accessible to the reader. 	
<p>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.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the methodology section (3.5), the authors specified the duration as 97.703. Measuring time to three decimal places seems impractical. Please revise this to a more reasonable level of precision. 2. The authors misinterpreted the results presented in Figure 8. Please clarify. 3. The discussion section of the manuscript is somewhat lacking, the interpretation and implications of these findings need further elaboration. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references were sufficient for this short article.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language in the manuscript can be improved. Consider consulting an English editing service or a peer with strong language skills for assistance</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript does not meet the necessary standards for publication in its current form. The manuscript suffers from a lack of depth in analysis and discussion, which significantly diminishes the impact and clarity of the findings. Furthermore, the overall preparation and presentation of the content are insufficient.</p>	

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:	Lee Yit Leng
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Malaysia