

#### SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Materials Science Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JMSRR_47808
Title of the Manuscript:	Activated Carbon for Electrochemical Supercapacitor and Water Filter
Type of the Article	Technical report

#### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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 agree highlight that part in the man his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul> <li>This work requires some revisions before it can be accepted for publication.</li> <li>1- Why the author jumped to call the cell assembly "Super capacitor "? no evidence before such claim was presented to call it this way?</li> <li>2- The authors should have presented CV studies before EIS studies because the CV in Figure 7 shows that the assembly possess a tangible capacitive current. I don't know if this capacitive current large enough to call it super capacitor or Not. So CV and other electrochemical techniques should come before EIS.</li> <li>3- In EIS the vertical line in Nyquist plot is evidence of charge saturation, but also there is a diffusional section in this plot (being ignored).</li> <li>4- The authors did not show CV or EIS for NiO Filter to see what difference was made by covering it with activated carbon? What was the porosity of the electrode?</li> <li>5- Using modern techniques without depth in analysis is not enough to give weight to the research work, some calculation can be made to get diffusion coefficient, relaxation timeetc are needed.</li> </ul>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

eed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and anuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write



# <u>PART 2:</u>

	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)
	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>issues here in details)</u>	

## **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Kasem K. Kasem
Department, University & Country	Indiana university Kokomo, Indiana