



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_48580
Title of the Manuscript:	A biogenerated polymetallic catalyst from society's wastes
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript entitles "A biogenerated polymetallic catalyst from society's wastes" focus on the preparation of green catalyst from the metal composite. In general, the manuscript is sound. However, there are some defects on the manuscript which should be improved by authors, such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is not so clear, especially on the methodology applied, for example: what the room temperature is used in preparing the composite? 2. The objective of work should be included in the section of Introduction. Please consider it properly. 3. The conclusion is not specific. Please rephrase it correctly. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I modify "room temperature" in 20-25°C either in the abstract or in experimental part 2. In the introduction it was reported that the objective of work was to prepare a new catalyst recovering metals from exhausted catalytic converters (first target) and to check if it was more efficient in the removal of polychloro biphenyls than mono- or bimetallic catalysts prepared by the same microorganism (second target). In my opinion the text is sufficiently clear and doesn't require changes. 3. I rephrase the conclusion according to the reviewer's comment. I hope that it is now more specific and clear.
Minor REVISION comments	n.a.	
Optional/General comments	It is suggested to review manuscript critically to ensure sentences are clear without any grammatical errors.	I hope that the manuscript is now clear

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	