

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Physical and Chemical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOPACS_80410
Title of the Manuscript:	New Dimension to the Physicochemical Characteristics of Ogwuta Source Clay
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.journalajopacs.com/index.php/AJOPACS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title: Recast the title, there is no “new dimension” in the work, I did not see new ways or methods of characterization different from the existing. 2. Abstract should be rewritten to have a good flow. Remove all the subtitles in Abstract (eg. Aim, methodology, etc). 3. “They are any group of hydrous aluminum silicates having diameter less than 0.005mm” citation needed 4. Materials: “The sample was sun-dried for 2-3 days” be specific, this is the work you carried out, how many day or hours did you sundried he samples 5. “These clay particles were sieved into 63 µm size” include sieve model 6. in section 2.4.1 pH Determination The mixture was stirred with glass rod and allowed to stand for 30 min and the pH taken. Be more scientific in choice of words “Taken” sounds more like coming from a grammarian than a scientist/ 7. Section 2.4.3 “a weighing balance” add equipment model 8. Recast the statement “. With the help of a dropping pipette, a drop of the slurry was made on the edge of a filter paper and the appearance of the drop observed”. Remove with the help and use a more scientific choice of words 9. Recast “A 1.0 mg of the sample was mixed with a little quantity of KBr in the ratio of 1:10 (1 mg: 10 mg)” (remove “little quantity”) 10. . “A little amount of the mixture was” what quantity be specific 11. “that is, clay samples from areas with lots of rainfall have pH values less than 3.5” citation needed 12. “specific surface area was found to be 133.4 m²g⁻¹” Why and what does this imply (I OBSERVE THE AUTHOR PRESENTED RESULTS WITHOUT DISCUSSING THEM. PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS “WHY IS THIS RESULTS SO AND WHAT ARE THE INDICATIONS, WHAT CAN THEY BE ATTRIBUTED TO, it will make the work more robust) 13. English check needed “The Scanning Electron Micrograph of the clay, as presented in Figures 1 revealed particles”. Consider Figure 1 since the figure is only one figure. 14. The dark patches in Fig 1 represent what? And why are those patches present? 15. Figures 3a-3c, Change to Figure 3(a-c) 16. Please discuss the Xrd results in details. Use the pattern to obtain the crystallinity index of the clay, the result was more or less dumped without discussion. Please use online materials and reference them properly. Highlight the miller indices or the interplanner spacing. Is the clay crystalline or amorphous in nature based on the Xrd pattern? What is the principle peak and what does it represents. 17. Figure 3a is not readable. 18. Table 3 is based on what? I can see more than 15 prominent peaks in Fig 3a 19. The FTIR result should be discussed in details. 20. Your work has no conclusion. Please conclude based on the result obtained. Is the aim of the work achieved? If yes, write the classification and the possible application based on the results. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	The work is good; however, the data obtained were presented and not discussed.	

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:	M.I Ejimofor
Department, University & Country	Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Nigeria