



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_35086
Title of the Manuscript:	Preparation, Microstructure and Performance of Activated FA / TiO ₂ -WO ₃ Composite Photocatalyst
Type of the Article	Full length 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The problem statement is not mentioned. The introduction is too brief and does not carry any hypothesis for the need for the present investigation. In introduction, the author mentioned UV is one of the limitation of TiO₂ but they have used the same in their study. If such limitations are mentioned one have to work on improving the stated issue in the work. The rationale why FA was considered was not clarified. The authors mentioned since abundantly available as waste so utilised. If it focuses in that aspect also how much share it is going to consume, very negligible. WO₃ is known to have band gap of 2.5 eV and TiO₂ of 3.2 eV and how UV photocatalysis was executed. The authors have not considered dark reaction and the control experiments. Without these one cannot conclude any. Also in all case the adsorption is dominant than photocatalysis then why this see the composite 60 % removal was achieved by only adsorption rest only attributed to photocatalysis phenomenon. In this case it is better to use the FA as adsorbent no need of impurity for photocatalyst. If a material is picked as composite to photocatalst it must contribute for the improvement of is weakness like utilisation of visible light, improving the life time of charge carriers or recovery of the photocatalyst etc but	1. Introduction section have revised partly in revision paper. 2 many research reports have mentioned limitation of TiO₂ and improving its absorption wavelength, this work focused on preparation method, other question ,please refer to our else work.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	no such improvement was seen. In abstract photocatalyst is misspelled as photocatalys. Adsorption-desorption hysteresis of the studied sample is missing. Over all the materials and the photocatalysis portion is too weak and needs revision by eliminating all the uncertainties.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		