

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJOCS_126196 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | A Review On Waste Water Treatment Using Electrocoagulation for Heavy Metals |
| Type of the Article | Review Article |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|---|--|
| Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | In terms of the “importance” of this manuscript, I currently give it a low score. The content is currently a basic review of the electrocoagulation process, a section about its importance, the detection of heavy metals, and treating microplastics. The manuscript currently is not really a review article for the treatment of wastewater using electrocoagulation for heavy metals. | It is an important contribution to the scientific community because of its applicability to present environmental issues and its ability to influence future research. |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | <u>The title is absolutely not suitable.</u> Currently, for this specific manuscript, a better title would be “What is electrocoagulation, and some mention of microplastics, and a paragraph about the detection of heavy metals” | Suitable Title "Electrocoagulation in Wastewater Treatment: A Comprehensive Review of Heavy Metal and Pollutant Removal" |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract needs to be re-written after the manuscript is <u>significantly</u> improved. | We have considered the reviewer suggestions and we made effort to improve abstract content. |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Absolutely not, the structure seems random with minimal coherence. | We made every effort to consider reviewer suggestions and provide an explanation of electrocoagulation. |
| Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The manuscript usually mentions correct concepts in terms of electrocoagulation; but the flow need to be improved significantly. | Incorporated a conclusion and significance, and made any necessary edits to the document. |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. - | <u>The references are not bad, a focus on the last 5 years is advised since there are dozens of articles pertaining to heavy metals and electrocoagulation.</u> | - |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language is currently not a major issue in this manuscript. | - |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | The authors need a systematically change/improve this manuscript to better fit the title. I advise that they check review articles in the literature to better understand the flow and content of a review article. Then they can design the sections of their article and what they want to include. | We have taken into account the reviewers' recommendations and have worked to enhance the review paper's substance. |

Review Form 3

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> | The authors affirm that there are no conflicts of interest or ethical concerns. Furthermore, this article is a pure review based on the knowledge and interests of the authors. This article's information and conclusions are based on published research and/or review papers. |