

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_126283
Title of the Manuscript:	Elimination of sulfate ions in water by addition of an acidified calcium carbonate suspension
Type of the Article	Research manuscript

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.	The present manuscript reports the elimination of sulfate ions in aqueous media by addition of an acidified calcium carbonate suspension. the manuscript is clearly written. The problem caused by the presence of sulfate ions in water is not clearly presented. I encourage the authors to improve the introduction and the conclusion of this manuscript.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable.	
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.	The abstract of the manuscript is comprehensible. However, the authors must avoid to talk about drinking water, because they have worked in the synthetic solutions. Please, review the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate	
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 manuscript is clearly written, but present some lacks like: they authors must improve the introduction and the explanation of their results (discussion). They also have to explain the percentage of calcite and gypsum given by XRD analysis. They have to talk about the future of the removed solid phase formed during the experiments. Please, precise the unity of the concentration of sulfate ions in the figure 1. In section II.5 give more informations regarding the spectrophotometer used to carry out the experiments.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is suitable.	
Optional/General comments	Please, review keywords and add others like "elimination"	

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:	Romuald Teguia Doumbi
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Rio Grande of Norte, Brazil