

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_84406
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ADSORPTION OF CRUDE OIL FROM SURFACE WATER USING ESTERIFIED RICE HUSK AND SAW DUST
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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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	<p>1.The abstract needs to be reformulated to include the most important results obtained and the impact of this on the comparison between the efficiency and performance of each of adsorbents used in this study.</p> <p>2.the aim of the study is to complete a previous study, so you need to mention the most important results of the previous study and compare them with the results of the current study in terms of conclusion.</p> <p>3. The dried rice husk and saw dust were carbonized in a muffle furnace need more clarification and was inert gas used?.</p> <p>4.The images in Figures 1,2,3 are extracted from previous study (Onoh et al. 2019). The prepared adsorbents in current study must be characterized using Scanning electron microscopy (SEM),</p>	<p>Response for number 1: Thank you very much for the observation. It has been addressed in the revised manuscript.</p> <p>Response for number 2: Thank you very much for the observation: however, the aim of this research is to compare the performance of the carbonized-cum-esterified rice husk and saw dust adsorbents for the adsorption of crude oil from surface water. The previous study meanwhile, reported different results; the kinetic, Isotherm and Thermodynamic findings. However, a little discussion with the previous study has been addressed in the revised manuscript too.</p> <p>Response for number 3: The saw dust and Rice husk carbonization process was off course, done in an inert environment. If not, the presence of oxygen will cause contamination of the product and corrosion of the reactor by scaling and chocking of the process line.</p> <p>Number 4: As stated in the abstract, it was characterised using SEM. Also, this study is to complete a previous study done by the same author, thanks.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1.it is important to determine the size and area of the pores for the prepared adsorbent materials and to examine the effect of the preparation process on them.</p> <p>2. Modification of the carbonized samples by base and comparison with Modification by acid.</p> <p>3.The results and discussion should include a discussion of the materials used in preparing the samples, the reasons for their use, and an explanation of the mechanism of their work</p>	<p>1)The adsorbent surface area and pore characteristics and elemental analysis were observed under adsorbent characterization.</p> <p>2) The aim of this report is not to compare different means of carbonization but, to compare two different adsorbents (Saw dust and Rice husk) thanks.</p> <p>3) Discussion on the materials used was presented in introduction and materials and method sections, thanks.</p>
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	