

Review Form2

Book Name:	Chemical and Materials Sciences: Developments and Innovations
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2362
Title of the Manuscript:	SOLVENT EXTRACTION OF CHROMIUM (III) USING TRIBUTYLPHOSPHINE OXIDE
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	By focusing on the extraction of chromium (III) ions from solution, this study can make an important contribution to the field of chemistry and materials science. Investigating the ability of a reactant such as tributylphosphine oxide (TBPO) to efficiently extract chromium (III) ions in various acidic solutions can be important for both theoretical and practical applications. The analyses of the study carried out under optimized experimental conditions increase the reliability of the results obtained. The identification of the extracted species and the comparison of the extraction efficiencies in different acid solutions make this study unique.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	In academic writing, a unique title strengthens the distinctiveness of the work and its place in the literature. Reusing the same title, especially when writing on the same topic, can cause confusion. To avoid this, it is best to make some changes in the title to emphasize the unique aspects of the study.	
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 can provide more information about what specific extraction yields were achieved. For example, "nearly quantitative" is a bit vague; clearer percentages could be given. How much of the "partial" extraction was performed should be more clearly stated. This may help the reader to better understand the results of the study. The effects of experimental variables such as pH, shaking time, metal ion concentration are emphasized, but specific information such as what pH ranges were used, what concentrations were tested, etc. could be included in the summary. More details about the anions and solvents used in the study could be provided. What solvents were used and what results were obtained? The identification of the extracted species is mentioned, but the chemical structures of these species or the significance of this finding is not emphasized in the abstract. This information may be important to emphasize the value of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I think it is sufficient and appropriate for the book chapter.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by thoroughly investigating the solvent extraction of chromium (III) using tributylphosphine oxide under various acidic conditions. The experimental design is well structured, with clear optimisation of parameters such as pH, shaking time and concentrations, which strengthens the validity of the findings. The results are presented in sufficient detail and the high reproducibility of the data supports the reliability and robustness of the method. Furthermore, the identification of the extracted species confirms the accuracy of the chemical processes involved, making the manuscript technically sound and scientifically robust.	

Review Form2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references cover a wide range of years, from 1958 to 2020. However, the list contains predominantly older studies, with several references dating back to the 1960s, 70s and 80s. While these foundational studies are important, the manuscript could benefit from more recent references to ensure that it is based on the latest advances in the field.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In general, a careful review can improve clarity and readability. In some places throughout the work there are multiple gaps between words, which should be read carefully from beginning to end.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cigdem Er Caliskan
Department, University & Country	Kirsehir Ahi Evran University, Turkey