Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JERR_116363**
Title of the Manuscript:	**CHARACTERIZATION OF MIXED AMINE FUNCTIONALIZED CARBON NANOTUBE FROM NIGERIAN SUB BITUMINOUS COAL**
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:

(https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.7

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. The manuscript provides insights into utilizing mixed amine functionalized carbon nanotubes for CO_2 adsorption, but its impact could be heightened with more novel discoveries 2. Yes, the title accurately represents the manuscript's investigation of mixed amine functionalized carbon nanotubes derived from Nigerian sub-bituminous coal for CO_2 adsorption. 3. Yes, the abstract summarizes the experimental methods, results, and implications of characterizing mixed amine functionalized carbon nanotubes from Nigerian sub-bituminous coal for CO2 adsorption but omits explicit mention of the manuscript's objectives 4. Yes, the manuscript's subsections and structure effectively organize the content, aiding readability, though renumbering the sections to start from "1. **Introduction**" would enhance clarity. 5. Yes, the manuscript appears scientifically sound, but additional experimental data could bolster its credibility, and addressing potential limitations would enhance its rigor. 6. No, the references are not sufficient or recent. Many of them are outdated, which could undermine the credibility of the research. Consider adding more up-to-date sources to enhance the manuscript's relevance and rigor.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	The inconsistency in formatting between table and figure captions detracts from the manuscript's overall professionalism and readability. Ensuring uniformity in font style, size, and emphasis would enhance the presentation quality, facilitating clearer communication of the research findings to readers The manuscript lacks clarity in specifying its objectives, hindering readers' understanding of the study's purpose and scope. Clearly defining the research objectives would provide readers with a better roadmap for comprehending the significance and context of the findings.	

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:	**Tolesa Tesfaye**
Department, University & Country	**Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia**