



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_44482
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization studies of Adsorptive Tendency of Flamboyant Pod Bark in Wastewater Treatment of 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol using Response Surface Methodology.
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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	This is a thorough paper but the Author(s) should take note of the following comments for better output. - Abstract should be revised and rewritten to show the highlights of what has been done and the results of your findings. Pg. 1 line 6-9: should be moved to the introduction. Introduction should be separated from the abstract. Pg. 1 line 12: Recast the sentence. The abstract should be recast completely because it is unclear in its current format. - Introduction is good but an improvement on the grammar needs to be effected. Pg. 2 line 49: formation not formation. Pg. 2 line 81: described in this section not described in the section. - Fig. 1 (A, B, C, D) y-axis title shall be made visible. Fig. 2 (A, B, C, D) y-axis title shall be made visible. Fig. 3 (A, B, C, D) y-axis title shall be made visible. Model fitting and validation should come before one factor plot and 3D-Surface. Pg. 7 line 205: 45° not 45o. Pg. 9 line 240-241: Recast the sentence because it has no meaning. - Rewrite the conclusion. In general, total grammar improvement is seriously needed in all sections, especially in the discussion of results. Some references are old. Author(s) have to update with the latest referencing on adsorption, especially those related to the use of naturally prepared activated carbon. The author(s) have to highlight the novelty of their study and compare their results with other data to improve the article quality. They have to compare their results with other published data to show the importance of their work.	All corrections have been implemented. We will like to point out here that one of the comments should be reviewed by our reviewer and go with our position on the way of presentation. The comment is under quote 'Model fitting and validation should come before one factor plot and 3D-Surface' We felt the behavior of each of the model parameters both at a factor and interaction level should come before model fitting and validation. The reason is because a good understanding of these different behaviors will guide on their corresponding behaviors during model presentations.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The paper should be accepted for publication after revision.	



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> No ethical issues.	