Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Research Journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IRJPAC_91615**
Title of the Manuscript:	**REMOVAL OF METHYLENE BLUE FROM INDUSTRIAL EFFLUENTS USING CORNCOB ACTIVATED CARBON**
Type of the Article	**paper**

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.journalirjpac.com/index.php/IRJPAC/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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	The paper titled "REMOVAL OF METHYLENE BLUE FROM INDUSTRIAL EFFLUENTS USING CORNCOB ACTIVATED CARBON" Comments There are some typing errors ABSTRACT e.g. line 6, (found. to be) remove the phrase INTRODUCTION line 9 (chemicals. to be chemical) line 18 (feasibility for. to be, feasibility of) 2.3.1. Batch adsorption aqueous solution Line 19 (respectively ;. Remove a space) 2.4.2. Adsorption isotherm models Line 3 (The equations. to be, Equations) Line 4 (concentration ;, Remove a space) 2.4.3. Error analysis Line 2 (were to be, was) 3.1. Properties of Activated Carbon Line 2 (charge to be, charges) 3.2. Effect of contact time on adsorption efficiency and kinetic study in aqueous solution Line 16 (analogues to be, analogs) Line 3 (That can be explained by the fact that in the initial adsorption stages several sites are available., to be, That can be explained by the fact that several sites are available in the initial adsorption stages.) 3.4. Adsorption capacities of methylene blue in aqueous solution Line 5 (showing, to be, indicating) Line 11 (favorable to be, a good) CONCLUSION "found to be" should be remove the phrase "The kinetic study showed that the methylene blue adsorption process was better described by the pseudo-second-order model, indicating that the adsorption process is limited by the chemisorption." Should written as "The kinetic study showed that the methylene blue adsorption process was better described by the	

	pseudo-second-order model, indicating that the chemisorption limits the adsorption process." Some references missing DIO and some of them needs to review to be according to journal submission rule. Some other comments Does this method will give benefit result with the wide range (water coming to houses from the main sources)? Is it possible to do this heating and continuously stirred on the wide range? To apply this research on the wide range how many activated carbons mass will be need? Is it possible to do this on wide range?	
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mastoura Mohamed Edrees Abdou**
Department, University & Country	**King Khalid University, KSA**