



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/1901
Title of the Manuscript:	PHOTOCATALYTIC DETOXIFICATION OF CHLOROBENZENE IN AQUEOUS SOLUTIONS

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	This paper does not merit publication due to the lack of novelty and significance.	
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract		
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	The importance of this study is well defined, however, very limited reference was cited, especially recent development was not discussed in detail.	More references have been cited including recent studies in the field
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	references are Insufficient and old.	Recent references are now cited
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	The authors did not provide the reaction temperature, which could be important if CB is absorbed during dark reaction but not degraded. In fact the authors also suffered about it, as was mentioned in the last paragraph in page 4.	The experiments were conducted at ambient conditions; 35°C in the laboratory (dark) and 65°C under sunlight irradiation
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	1. The discussion conducted is superficial without any mechanim aspect. 2. No any comments about the products of CB oxidation, CO,CO2, or other complicated compounds? 3. Absorption of CB by catalyst powders should be discussed. 4. Why CB can be oxidized in dark reaction at low temperatures? 5. The relationship between the functional groups in PSA, SSA and their catalytic performance? 6. In Figs. 5-7, which catalyst was used? 7.....	1 The discussion is now well laid out 2. The objective of the study is not on the assay of the reaction products but a holistic comparative one 3. This is discussed 4. This is also mentioned 5. This effect is now discussed 6. The figures are now presented to show the comparative nature of the study
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	The authors should point out and demonstrate to the readers in what way their results can bring about new scientific understanding.	Appropriate conclusion had been drawn based on the results of the study
References	Insufficient and old.	Recent references are now cited