

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJPAC_129690
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of selected conditions on the efficiency of carbonate precipitation of Cu(II), Ni(II), Pb(II) and Zn(II) ions
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	chemical precipitation is a simple and easy-to-operate method for the removal of heavy metals. By chemical precipitation we mean a method in which heavy metal ions are converted into solid particles under the influence of an appropriate agent by adjusting the pH	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, 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.	No, Abstract should contain some quantitative information. Some important results must be added to abstract. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors study " Influence of selected conditions on the efficiency of carbonate precipitation of Cu(II), Ni(II), Pb(II) and Zn(II) ions". The quality of this paper is overall good, and recommend that the authors address the major issues before resubmitting the manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract does not demonstrate scientific value. Please strictly follow the following outline when writing your abstract: Purpose; Design / methodology / approach; Conclusions; practical value; Originality and significance of the results. IMPORTANT! The authors should provide the main numerical results and conclusions in the abstract and report on filling the gap in the studied area of knowledge and explain what exactly the authors have achieved 2. Authors can include another literature of carbonate precipitation effect on the heavy metal removal efficiency in the introduction section. Authors may explain deficiencies or shortcomings of other new studies to make a bridge to introducing the novelty of their work. 3. The main objective of the work must be written more clearly and concisely at the end of the introduction section. 4. The introduction section needs more papers cited; for example, each method of removing heavy metals must be supported by reference. It is suggested to use and cite the following articles to improve the introduction: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dwt.2024.100744 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsufi.2024.100260 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jics.2024.101378 5. In the Chemicals and Reagents section, the authors should have written this section with more precision and detail and thus must have added the following data: the chemical properties of salts used and where they were purchased or obtained. How to use chemicals with or without further purification? 6. Why was the pH value set at 8? Was this deduced from an experimental work, or was it deduced from previous studies? If it was deduced from previous studies, please support this principle with references. 7. Why was the pollutant concentration of 500 used, as this concentration is considered very high? please clarify this issue. 8. The quality of figure very poor, please consider this issue. 9. In section 3.1, figure 2 shows the removal efficiency increase with increased rpm, then decrease efficiency at rpm = 800; authors should describe the chemical behavior of this phenomenon and must be supported with references. As well as in figures 2 and 3, it must describe the chemical behavior and also add the cause of the increase or decrease of efficiency. 10. In figure 2, why it obtained the same removal efficiency without mixing and when the mixing speed with 800 rpm, authors should also describe the chemical behavior of this phenomenon. 11. In a binary multicomponent system consisting of Cu(II) and Ni(II) paragraph "The same behavior of Cu(II) ions the optimal mixing speed of the solution was 100 rpm" in fig.1 the optimal mixing speed was 300 rpm but in this paragraph define optimal mixing speed was 100 rpm, please clarify this confusion. 12. In paragraph "Similar behavior was shown by the Ni(II) ion in the binary multicomponent system", Similar behavior with what? please clarify this confusion. 13. Section 3.2 also needs more justification for why increased or decreased removal efficiency 	

Review Form 3

	with time; the author should have described the chemical behavior for these states. 14. In overall, the results obtained need more discussion, justification, and more supported by references.	
--	--	--

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:	Fatin A. Alnasrawi
Department, University & Country	University of Karbala, Iraq