

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.	This article is important because it explains the effect of the amount of kaolinite, sintering temperature and sintering time on membrane preparation. In addition, it provides us optimal membrane possesses characteristics such as porosity, permeability, mechanical strength and an average pore size with response surface methods based on Box-Behnken design. Therefore, it supports the literature on ceramic MF membrane by combining kaolinite and rice husk.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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 results of the economic analysis should also be given in the article.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the title of the manuscript is suitable scientifically. The analysis results of the trials conducted in accordance with the experimental set are consistent with each other. This proves the scientific accuracy of the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references of the article are sufficient and recent.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article should be written in higher quality English.	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elif Godekmerdan
Department, University & Country	Ege University, Turkey