

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	

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	Studying the solvent extraction of zinc from burnt tyre ash using TBP is important because it addresses environmental concerns, promotes resource efficiency, advances extraction technologies, supports industrial needs, and contributes to sustainable waste management strategies.	
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.	Yes, the article of abstract comprehensive. But, add some points how your research results (values) will be helpful in the future directions (Based on the Environmental considerations).	
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.	<p>Overall, the content provided outlines a scientific study on the solvent extraction of zinc from burnt tyre ash leach liquor using tributylphosphate (TBP). Here are a few points regarding the scientific correctness of the content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study follows a structured experimental design including the dissolution of burnt tyre ash in hydrochloric acid, followed by solvent extraction using TBP under controlled conditions (pH, temperature, agitation). This methodological approach is appropriate for investigating metal recovery from secondary sources. Atomic absorption spectrophotometry is correctly utilized to measure zinc concentrations in both the leach liquor and the extracted organic phase. This technique is standard in analytical chemistry for quantifying metal content accurately. The results present quantitative data on zinc extraction efficiency (%), indicating specific conditions such as TBP concentration, phase ratio, and pH that optimize zinc extraction. The use of clear numeric values (e.g., 35.05% extraction efficiency) enhances the clarity and scientific rigor of the findings. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, suitable	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Figure 1.0: Reaction of Zinc to form Zincates (Reactions we need to write in the manuscript, do not copy and past somewhere).2. Figure 4 : Instrumentation of Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy (What is the need of this figure, since its general one)3. In research article should not mention preparation procedure details and also materials and equipment listed (not necessary).4. Write cm3 instead of cm³ throughout the manuscript.5. lixiviant for 97:703 minutes??? What do u mean?6. Include comparison table along with your results.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samraj S
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India