



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	

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		
Minor REVISION comments	This manuscript reported about the FA/TiO₂-WO₃ composite photocatalyst and the application in methyl orange dye degradation. The FA/TiO₂-WO₃ composite was characterized by XRD, SEM, and EDS. From my point of view, this manuscript contains information that can be of interest for the scientific community and recommend its publication. However, amendments must be done before final publication. Below are listed my observations. 1. As is known to us, there are many manuscripts about TiO₂-WO₃ composite and their applications in photocatalytic, such as (1) Applied Physics A, 2016, 6(122): 1-10. (2) ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering, 2016, 4(3): 1581-1590. (3) Topics in Catalysis, 2016, 10(59): 996-1001. 2. Authors used two express about XRD peaks in page 2 line 76 and page 2 line 77, such as, "16.39 °, 26.01 °, 26.27 °, 33.23 °, 26.58 °, 20.86 °" and "2θ=25.80, 48.04 and 55.07", please check it carefully. 3. The clarity of some figures is not good, such as figure 1 and figure 3. And I can't see the scale bar in the SEM images (Fig. 2). Therefore, the authors should upload high-resolution (at least 300 dpi) for each figures. 4. Can the authors show the other SEM images for obtaining different morphologies of different nanostructures?	1. This work is different from other article This research focused on how ease to supported photocatalyst via activating and modifying method. 2. "2θ=" has been deleted, using a consistent



SDI Review Form 1.6

	5. The stability of samples should be investigated in photocatalytic. 6. Some recently literatures about photocatalysts are suggested to be mentioned, for example, Applied Surface Science, 2014, 317: 414-421; Applied Surface Science, 2015, 340: 18-24; Ceramics International, 2016, 42: 2854-2860; Applied Physics A: Materials Science & Processing, 2016, 122: 1020-1029; Ceramics International, 2016, 42: 7192-7202; Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology A: Chemistry, 2016, 329: 175-181. 7. There are some grammatical errors in the manuscript. Please check it carefully.	representation. 3. We have made the appropriate changes in revised paper 4. The new SEM images was added 5. The stability of the photocatalyst study have been investigated in other article. 6. Thank you for your suggestion. 7. We have modified the grammatical errors carefully.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		