



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	MS_JPRI_59686
Title of the Manuscript:	DEFLUORIDATION POTENTIAL OF RICE HUSK, GROUNDNUT SHELL AS A CONVENTIONAL ALTERNATIVE FOR FLUORIDE REMOVAL – A REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review Article

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>1. The manuscript should undergo professional proofread. There are quite numbers of grammatical problems and unclear sentences.</p> <p>2. Introduction</p> <p>a) "Thus several defluoridation techniques were introduced to prevent fluorosis. Please check and rewrite the sentences. The defluoridation technique is not to overcome fluorosis. The defluoridation technique is for fluoride removal. The fluoride removal in water is needed to prevent fluorosis. Please be clear. This comment was same as comment No.2(e).</p> <p>b) "They include bone charcoal, contact precipitation, Algona, activated alumina, ion-exchange technique, membrane filtration, nanofiltration, and clay." No coherence in this and before sentence. The listed techniques also were misled. Please differentiate between technique and adsorbent/media used in the defluoridation technique.</p> <p>c) The correction of introduction section is highly recommended. Please ensure the spelling, the format and sentences arrangement is good.</p> <p>d) "In this research we are studying/analyzing the Defluoridation potential.." Please be sure in choosing your words. "Studying" or (and) "analyzing"? Don't put '/' in your sentences.</p> <p>e) "Thus this review.....used to prevent fluorosis....." and 'In this research..... for fluoride removal.' Both of these sentences were repeated and the meaning of these sentences are different. The use of rice husk and groundnut shell is for fluoride removal. The fluoride removal in water is needed to prevent fluorosis. Please be clear. This comment was same as comment No.2(a).</p> <p>f) Authors successfully provide the advantages of Rice husk and groundnut shell for defluoridation compared with others adsorbent due to low cost. However, authors should explained the reason for choosing two adsorbents of rice husk and groundnut shell instead of focusing in one adsorbent. Authors also fail to compare both of the adsorbent performance in defluoridation.</p> <p>3. The manuscript title is 'Defluoridation Potential of Rice Husk, Groundnut Shell as a Conventional Alternative for Fluoride Removal – A Review'. The manuscript section title and contents do not discuss critically and illustrate as the title.</p> <p>a) The section of Role of fluoride in bone health, Role of fluoride in dental health, Fluoride toxicity should be under Introduction.</p> <p>b) The section of Defluoridation Potential of Rice Husk and Groundnut Shell, - Authors should elaborated, discussed critically and compared among the past studies about Rice Husk and Groundnut shell for fluoride removal. - Authors should include the development research mode of previous studies, weakness, limitation and result benefits. - Authors should review the past studies on the regeneration cycle of Rice Husk and Groundnut Shell and the procedure to dispose the adsorbent. This is to answer the authors concern about high fluoride in water resources which may affects the life being.</p> <p>4. Conclusion. The conclusion needs to be rephrased. Authors are strongly recommended to reflect back the objectives of the review paper in the conclusion. Please avoid in repeating and elaborating what you have discussed in previous section.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, authors have focus more on the fluoride harmful discussion which can be count as subtopic of the Introduction. Authors should provide critically argument discussion on the fluoride removal using rice husk and groundnut shell. I am suggesting, the manuscript needs to be organised back. The compulsory comments should be taken seriously.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Nur Amirah Mohd Zahri
Department, University & Country	University Malaya, Malaysia