

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_129807
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Affordable Ceramic Microfiltration Membrane Using Rice Husk as a Pore Former for Brewery Water Treatment.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The subject is current given the use of natural waste for the manufacture of a filtration membrane used for the manufacture of beer.	Ok
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable	Ok
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.	no	Ok
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct	Ok
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some reference must be added the reference is not so recent 2006-2020	Done. All the reference suggested have been added to the manuscript.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	suitable	Ok
Optional/General comments	<p>The subject is current given the use of natural waste for the manufacture of a filtration membrane used for the manufacture of beer.</p> <p>Some remarks must be taken into account by the authors of this work who are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Adding PCM as an agent for water purification you add the following references in your introduction as well as in the equations <p>K. Hidouri, H. Togun, F. L Rashi, a. M. Abed, A.K. Hussein, B. Ali, S. Rout, M. B. B. Hamida, U. Biswal. Environmental studies for various simple and hybrid solar still configurations : a comprehensive review. <i>Journal of Thermal Engineering (2024)</i> 10(6):1698-1714 DOI 10.14744/thermal.0000877</p> <p>H. Ajari, F. Khaled, H. Akrou, H. Khaoula, B. Chaouachi, Q. Alsahy. Novel composite membrane based on Recycled low-density polyethylene-alumina used for vacuum membrane distillation. <i>Bulletin of the National Research Centre (2023) indexing services including PubMed Central and Web of Science (Clarivate Analytics) ISSN: 2522-8307.</i></p> <p>H. Ajari, K. Hidouri, H. Akrou, F. Khaled, B. H. Ali, B. Chaouachi, Q. Alsahy. Improvement of a novel polymeric membrane performance by adding alumina powder for seawater desalination. <i>Desalination and water treatment doi: 10.5004/dwt.2023.30191 (2023)</i></p> <p>A. Hamzaoui, K. Hidouri, B. Chaouachi. Comparative study of the performance of a locally manufactured membrane and the commercial one in vacuum distillation (VMD) of brackish water. (2022). <i>Desalination and water treatment doi: 10.5004/dwt.2022.28029 (2022)</i></p> <p>H. Khaled, K. Hidouri, B. Chaouachi. Hybrid desalination combining microbial cells and reverse osmosis. <i>JP Journal of Heat and Mass Transfer. http://dx.doi.org/10.17654/0973576322019.26 (2022) 179-196</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ For sections 2.2 and 2.3 add real and schematic photos to fully understand the experimental part ✓ For all equations added in references the question where all the equations come from ✓ Why did you use the pressure 0.08mPa? ✓ Figures 1, 2, 3 to be redone are not clear 	<p>Ok</p> <p>Done. All the references have been added accordingly.</p> <p>Done. Schematic have been added for better understanding.</p> <p>There are all included.</p> <p>It is actually 0.0017MPa which is now corrected. This is within the range of pressure for dead-end microfiltration operations, laboratory standard(0-0.12bar). This is the pressure generated by the pump used.</p> <p>The publisher may need to enlarge a bit for clarity. They are clear from this end.</p>

[Review Form 3](#)

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>	