

Review Form2

Book Name:	Research Advances in Environment, Geography and Earth Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2430
Title of the Manuscript:	Composite Material Based on Clay and TiO2 forWastewater Treatment
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.	The paper presents valuable research with practical applications, especially in regions with limited access to clean water. It addresses a significant issue, offers an innovative approach, and provides promising results.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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 of the article is generally comprehensive but can be refined for better clarity and impact. The objective should be more specific, emphasizing the development and assessment of a clay-TiO□ composite for wastewater treatment. Additionally, the methodology could briefly mention the two-step treatment process involving filtration and the use of the composite material. The abstract currently mentions the parameters analyzed (pH, turbidity, etc.) and the results, but it could be clearer by directly stating the significant reduction in pollutants and pathogens, ensuring that the treated water meets WHO standards. Also, consider highlighting the potential practical applications of this research in real-world scenarios, particularly in regions with limited access to clean water. Streamlining these points will make the abstract more concise and informative, providing a clearer snapshot of the research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, but some improvements could enhance clarity and readability. The introduction effectively sets up the research but could better highlight the research gap and objectives. The methodology section is well-organized but could benefit from more detail, especially regarding the synthesis of the composite material, and might include a flowchart or diagram for clarity. The results and discussions are well-structured, though separating the results from the discussion or clearly distinguishing them would help in interpreting the findings. The conclusion is concise but could briefly mention potential practical applications and future research directions. Overall, the manuscript flows logically, but ensuring smooth transitions between sections and possibly including a brief literature review would strengthen the paper.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its systematic approach to addressing a significant environmental issue-wastewater treatment. The use of clay and TiO□ as composite materials for pollutant removal is well-supported by both theoretical foundations and experimental evidence. The authors have conducted thorough physico-chemical and bacteriological analyses, demonstrating that their method effectively reduces contaminants to meet WHO standards. Additionally, the methodology is clearly outlined, allowing for reproducibility, which is a key indicator of scientific rigor.	

Review Form2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Okay, The references in the manuscript appear to be a mix of foundational and relevant studies, but they may benefit from the inclusion of more recent sources. While some references are essential for providing historical context and supporting established methods, incorporating recent publications (preferably from the last 5-7 years) would strengthen the manuscript's connection to current research trends.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Okay, clear	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript addresses an important issue by exploring the use of clay and TiO ₂ composites for wastewater treatment, a topic with significant practical implications. The study's focus on both physico-chemical and bacteriological improvements adds depth and relevance. It would be beneficial to include a more detailed discussion on the potential scalability of the treatment method and its applicability in different settings. Additionally, incorporating a comparison with other treatment methods could provide valuable context. Overall, the research is promising and could make a meaningful contribution to the field with some minor revisions and enhancements.	

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:	M. Mohammed Mohaideen
Department, University & Country	Malla Reddy College of Engineering and Technology, India