



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Chemical Science International Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_45825
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of Methylene Blue from textile by Differential Pulse Voltammetry Using Cobalt Hexacyanoferrate Modified Carbon Paste Electrode
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:

(<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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rules and using abbreviation. Abbreviations that are defined in the abstract will need to be defined again at first use in the main text. Terms that are already defined should not be redefined again otherwise it is a duplication of effort. And once you defined "CoHCF", avoid switching back to the full term, otherwise it is pointless to define them in the first place.</li> <li>2. Abstract can be better. Write in a single paragraph. Abstract are meant to capture audience's interest within a glance of an eye. Remove unnecessary detail such as the place and duration. Aim and study design area basically the title of this manuscript.</li> <li>3. Introduction is superficial and shallow. Introduction is meant to be used to provide background and tailor to authors' advantages. The introduction should be expand more and focus more on carbon paste electrode, existing studies, why cobalt hexacyanoferrate can be a potential modifier, and why is methylene blue chosen for this study.</li> <li>4. Language. Decide whether you want to use US English (Color) or UK English (Colour). Do not use both simultaneously. Please correct for the whole manuscript. See example below <a href="https://www.babbel.com/en/magazine/what-are-the-differences-between-american-and-british-english/">https://www.babbel.com/en/magazine/what-are-the-differences-between-american-and-british-english/</a></li> <li>5. Line 71. Wrong header numbering.</li> <li>6. Section 2.5. This section is unclear. From the text written there, authors vague describe where the dyes wastewater was collected. Is it the dye waste from the dyeing section? Or the post-dyeing wastewater? Do the waste samples contain other type of dyes? Or is it really just methylene blue? Please clarify.</li> <li>7. Write the dye as "methylene blue", not "Methylene Blue".</li> <li>8. Authors were using full term of methylene blue and alizarin throughout the manuscript and decide to switch to abbreviation from section 3.3.3 onward? Please do that at first use, and correct the rest to the abbreviations. Do the same for all the figures' caption.</li> <li>9. Please provide a voltammogram of the MB-spiked textile waste</li> <li>10. in the conclusion, there is no point defining the abbreviation in the conclusion.</li> </ol>	<b>The authors corrected as per reviewers comment</b>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	General comments. The experimental and the scientific discussion seem alright. However there are too many minor errors, especially with the abbreviation and consistency of the language and word choice. The abstract and the introduction need a lot of improvement. Please see the specific comments listed above and use them to further improve the quality of the manuscript.	The authors corrected as per reviewers comment

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	