



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOCS_53185
Title of the Manuscript:	Superhydrophobic treatment of polyurethane sponge and its application in oil-water separation
Type of the 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wording should be highly improved. This is a major drawback.</li> <li>2. It is not clear at all what is the purpose of the studies described in sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4. What is the reason for presenting these results? Discussion about the goals of these studies should be provided.</li> <li>3. In the experimental (section 2.2) only the treatment with 1-Dodecanethiol is described. Treatments with Decyl mercaptan, AR and 1-Octadecanethiol,AR are not described.</li> <li>4. Figure 5 should be explained in more detail. What is the reason for this type of behaviour?</li> <li>5. In the experimental the authors wrote that CA measurements were carried out five times. They have to describe the standard deviations or provide error bars in the plots.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Thanks! It is really true as reviewer suggest that wording is a major drawback.We have improved the wording and modified some expressions in the article.</li> <li>2. Thanks! We further elaborated on the purpose in sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4. Also we added the discussions about the possible causes for those results.</li> <li>3. Thanks! We are very sorry for our negligence, and we have provided the missing content at section 2.2.</li> <li>4. Thanks! We have explained the reasons for the occurrence of Figure 5 in details and cited relevant literature to support it.</li> <li>5. Thanks a lot for the reviewer's comments, we have supplemented the maximum and the average standard deviations of CAs in the corresponding sections of the study.</li> </ol>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. There is a huge literature on the topic of oil-water separation. The authors cited only 16 references. The introduction should be enriched and more references should be included.</li> <li>7. Section 3.9 (Analysis of surface wettability) should not be a separate section and should be embedded into section 3.6 (The influence of the mercaptans on wettability).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Thanks! We have enriched the introduction and introduced more references.</li> <li>7. Thanks! After examining the manuscript, we agreed with part of the comment that section 3.9 (Analysis of surface wettability) should not be a separate section. However, it was different from the comment, we considered that embedding section 3.9 (Analysis of surface wettability) into section 3.5(The influence of concentration on wettability) is a better choice.</li> </ol>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	