Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJARR_88008**
Title of the Manuscript:	**OPTIMIZATION OF PROCESS PARAMETERS FOR ADSORPTION OF PHENOL FROM AQUEOUS SOLUTION USING UNRIPE PLANTAIN PEELS ACTIVATED CARBON**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	• **Some references are not scientific data (E.g.: references 1 and 14). Authors must use only books or scientific articles accepted for publication. Authors must standardize the citation stile.** • **Introduction section seems biased (half of the text uses only a citation of a non-scientific reference); Authors presented no references for too many statements made in this section; There was no justificative for the application of the phenols as adsorbate. Authors stated what the work did, but not its aims instead.** • **Does the assays were made in duplicate or triplicate? Do authors have a justification for single repetition on the experiments?** • **"Surface area" graphs presuppose that part of the graph shows some "coated" area. Graphs on figures 2 to 4 are no surface area graphs, and it shall be corrected.** • **During the discussions, Authors should bring some short explanation when comparing their results with those results from the literature, in other to allow readers to understand the reason why and how the cited articles corroborate with the findings presented.** • **Item 3.2.3 are poor in discussion. Authors should better explore these results. (E.g.: May the initial phenols concentration affect the application of the composites on real remediation/WW treatment plant, or limit it?)** • **Authors should present their main findings on the text of the conclusion, not as a table. Does the main objective of the work was achieved? Yes, no? Why? Does authors have any Furter ideas to expand this work?**	
Minor REVISION comments	• % Units and ratios must be presented as wt or ww. • Gravimetric assays must be expressed as dry or wet basis (e.g.: Ash content of 9,02%ww (wet basis)). • Item 2.4 is calling a table located in the results. Authors must avoid it. • Does the medium oh pH of 2, 6,5 and 11 buffered? • Authors should indicate the supplier and purity of all chemicals used (even saying that they were analytical grade). • Figure 1 present data units in %, but scale (y) in ‰. • Figure 2 X axis should present ionic charge representation corrected. • Figures 2 and 3 must be cited in the sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 respectively.	
Optional/General comments	• Units like m^2/g or mg/g may be better presented if they were as $m^2\ g^{-1}$ and mg g^{-1}. The application of these composites to remove phenols seems to be an interesting novelty. Article results presentation are very clear. Discussions are direct and fair (no biased). However, there are a several points that must be increased before publication.	

Review Form 1.6

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Leonardo Zanata**
Department, University & Country	**Universidade Federal do ABC, Brazil**