

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_123157
Title of the Manuscript:	Cadmium remediation from water using low-cost modified Biochar: An Approach towards Sustainable
Type of the Article	

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>
<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>This manuscript presents a valuable contribution to the scientific community, particularly in the field of environmental remediation. The study's focus on utilizing low-cost modified biochar for cadmium remediation from water aligns with the urgent need for sustainable and cost-effective solutions to address heavy metal pollution. The research is well-grounded in current environmental challenges and offers practical insights that could be widely applicable in real-world scenarios. I appreciate the manuscript for its innovative approach and its potential to advance sustainable practices in water treatment.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, for sure the title is suitable for this work.</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 of the manuscript is relatively comprehensive, summarizing the key aspects of the study, including the problem addressed (cadmium contamination), the solution proposed (low-cost modified biochar), and the outcomes. However, to enhance clarity and provide a more complete overview, a few suggestions are made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Addition of Specific Results: The abstract could benefit from including specific quantitative results or findings, such as the percentage of cadmium removal achieved or comparisons to other methods. This would provide readers with a clearer understanding of the effectiveness of the approach. 2. Methodological Highlights: A brief mention of the modification process of the biochar, such as the types of modifications applied or the materials used, would offer more insight into the innovative aspects of the study. 3. Implications for Sustainability: Expanding on how this method contributes to sustainability, particularly in terms of cost, accessibility, or environmental impact, could strengthen the abstract's emphasis on the significance of the work. 4. Future Directions or Applications: A sentence suggesting potential applications or future research directions based on this study would provide a forward-looking perspective, appealing to researchers interested in building on this work. <p>If these elements are already present but not prominent, they could be made more explicit to ensure the abstract fully captures the study's scope and impact.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but ensuring clarity and detail in each section could enhance its overall effectiveness.</p>	
<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>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its thorough investigation of cadmium remediation using modified biochar, supported by well-conducted experiments and comprehensive data analysis. The study employs a systematic approach to evaluate the efficiency and sustainability of the low-cost biochar modifications, with clear explanations of the methodologies and results. The inclusion of detailed characterization and performance metrics, alongside a critical assessment of the environmental impact, further underscores the scientific rigor of the work. Overall, the manuscript demonstrates a solid understanding of the principles of adsorption and environmental remediation, contributing valuable insights to the field.</p>	
<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 provided in the manuscript are generally sufficient and cover a broad range of relevant studies. However, to enhance the manuscript's relevance and impact, I suggest incorporating more recent references, particularly those published within the last 2-3 years, to reflect the latest advancements in cadmium remediation and biochar technology. Additionally, including recent reviews or meta-analyses on similar topics could offer a more comprehensive context and support the manuscript's findings.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, there are areas where clarity and precision could be improved, including the refinement of technical terminology and the correction of any grammatical errors. Ensuring consistency in terminology and enhancing the overall readability will help convey the scientific content more effectively.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript presents a valuable investigation into the use of low-cost modified biochar for cadmium remediation from water, highlighting an innovative and sustainable approach. The study is well-grounded in scientific principles and offers practical implications for environmental management. However, the manuscript could benefit from a clearer abstract, more detailed subsections, and a comprehensive review of recent literature to enhance its robustness and relevance. Improving the language and addressing any minor technical issues will further strengthen the manuscript's contribution to the field.	

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:	Abubakar Muhd Shafi'i
Department, University & Country	Mewar University, India