
[WJST] Submission Acknowledgement

1 pesan

Editor of Walailak J Sci & Tech <journal.wu@gmail.com>
Kepada: Erman Taer <erman.taer@lecturer.unri.ac.id>

13 September 2021 pukul 11.24

Dear Professor Erman Taer:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "An Environmental Approach in Production of Activated Carbon Monolithic derived from Garlic Peels for Supercapacitor Application: Porous Carbon Monolithic derived from Garlic Peels for Supercapacitor" to Walailak Journal of Science and Technology (WJST). With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Manuscript URL: <https://wjst.wu.ac.th/index.php/wjst/authorDashboard/submission/23986>
Username: ermantaer

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work and hope you will enjoy publishing in this journal, and look forward to receiving articles from you in future.

PS. We encourage authors to submit the names of 5-7 referees suitable to review the work to aid in the peer review process.

Editor of Walailak J Sci & Tech
2019 SCImago Journal Rank (SJR): 0.154

Walailak Journal of Science and Technology (WJST)
<https://wjst.wu.ac.th>
2020 SJR (SCOPUS): 0.146

[WJST] Manuscript Decision ID

1 pesan

Sujinda Youngjeen <journal.wu@gmail.com>

12 Oktober 2021 pukul 11.19

Kepada: Erman Taer <erman.taer@lecturer.unri.ac.id>, Apriwandi Apriwandi <apriwandi95@gmail.com>, Widya Sinta Mustika <widyasintam@gmail.com>, Miftah Ainul Mardiah <miftahainul.mardiah@gmail.com>, Rika Taslim <rikataslim@gmail.com>

Dear Professor Erman Taer, Apriwandi Apriwandi, Widya Sinta Mustika, Miftah Ainul Mardiah, Rika Taslim:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to Walailak Journal of Science and Technology (WJST), "An Environmental Approach in Production of Activated Carbon Monolithic derived from Garlic Peels for Supercapacitor Application: Porous Carbon Monolithic derived from Garlic Peels for Supercapacitor". Please revise the manuscript carefully. The manuscript should be resubmitted along with point-by-point explanation according to reviewers' comments. If you disagree with any of the comments, please state your reasons. **All corrections are mandatory and must be differentiated with red colour and submit it.**

Our decision is to: Revise the Manuscript

We request that you send a revised manuscript within 21 days, otherwise it may be considered withdrawn.

PS. Please submit in Microsoft Word version with WJST template, the references should be in WJST format, please recheck. Thank you very much for your kind helps.

STEP for upload revised version: Submissions > My Queue > My Assigned > Review > Revisions > Upload file

Author Guidelines: <https://wjst.wu.ac.th/index.php/wjst/about/submissions#authorGuidelines>

2019 SCImago Journal Rank (SJR): 0.154

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Originality of the work

Good

Experimental design and methodology

Good

Adequacy of the discussion

Good

Technical accuracy

Good

Suitability of references

Adequate

Use of Tables and Figures

Excellent

Standard of English

Good

Clarity and conciseness

Good

Referee's Comments

There are some important notes to be taken into account that are presented in the uploaded file.

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Originality of the work

Adequate

Experimental design and methodology

Adequate

Adequacy of the discussion

Adequate

Technical accuracy

Adequate

Suitability of references

Adequate

Use of Tables and Figures

Adequate

Standard of English

Adequate

Clarity and conciseness

Poor

Referee's Comments

- [1]“production of activated carbon as electrode material in supercapacitor applications”. Explain why activated carbon could be used in supercapacitor? [abstract part]
- [2]Explain why garlic peels have been recommended for activated carbon electrodes?
- [3]“the products of activated carbon were washed with DI water until the pH level of 7”. How can you control this step [until the pH is 7]?
- [4]Production of Activated Carbon Monolithic derived from Garlic Peels for Supercapacitor. I believe that there are many researchers did this project. What is the different between your work and other research results?
- [5] “some elemental volatiles such as oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen were released at high temperatures by the carbonization treatment” How did you know? Please provide evidence to support it.
- [6] the highest concentration of KOH of 0.75 M led to high density, with less bubbles and some solid K-byproducts. Explain.
- [7] Which sample contained SiO₂ and CaCO₃? Why?
- [8]Label diffraction peak in XRD pattern [figure 3]
- [9]Provide consistency data in text and Table 1. [the range of 3.6- 3.6 and 1.95-2.02]
- [10] Provide surface area for all samples.
- [11] This process was obtained due to the incomplete removal of the K-byproduct. How can remove potassium in samples?
- [12] Why cannot see the amount of chlorine in Table 2?
- [13] May I know the percentage of microporous, mesoporous and macroporous in all samples?
- [14] The ISO 4 standard abbreviation of Biomass and Bioenergy is Biomass Bioenergy

Reviewer E:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Originality of the work

Adequate

Experimental design and methodology

Adequate

Adequacy of the discussion

Adequate

Technical accuracy

Adequate

Suitability of references

Good

Use of Tables and Figures

Poor

Standard of English

Adequate

Clarity and conciseness

Adequate

Referee's Comments

The authors tried to produce an activated carbon monolithic (ACM) derived from garlic peels using various concentrations of potassium hydroxide as an activating agent. The authors perform a variety of technics to study the properties of ACM. This work is good and has its importance in improving the production of ACM, which is known for its many uses. However, there are some shortcomings in form and content, which are as follows:

- 1- The author must put in the text Bragg's Law and Debye-Scherrer equation and explain each factor in these equations, this will increase the article clarity and remove confusion.
- 2- The caption of Table 2 is too short and does not make sense. So i suggest the following caption: elemental contents of ACM synthesized at various concentrations of Activating agent (KOH).
- 3- It is more useful to increase the credibility of the work by putting at least a figure showing the EDS analysis.

Reviewer F:

Recommendation: See Comments

Originality of the work

Adequate

Experimental design and methodology

Good

Adequacy of the discussion

Good

Technical accuracy

Adequate

Suitability of references

Good

Use of Tables and Figures

Good

Standard of English

Adequate

Clarity and conciseness

Good

Referee's Comments

DETAILED FEEDBACK ON THE MANUSCRIPT

Comments in "Introduction" section:

Page 1, Comment no. 1: Line no.1, "A supercapacitor is a well-known alternative method"
Supercapacitor is not a method but it is an electronic device that stores the electric charges. So as per author's statement, author's said supercapacitor is method, which cannot have the function to store the electric charges. The above statement really diverged the reader's interest and the further reading and ultimately away from the manuscript due to first impression.
I suggest to authors to revise the above statement as "A supercapacitor material preparation by biomass processes is a well-known alternative method to green technology" or also it should write in another way as "A biomass-based supercapacitor material preparation is a well-known alternative method to green technology".

Page 1, Comment No.2. Line no.2 "Its advantages include"
these three words are not better matched for the viewpoint of the readers. So I suggest the authors to write it as, "Its advantages are" or " It has advantages includes... .."

Page 1, Comment No.3. Line no.8 "A well-designed of electrode materials have been designed"
For the reader's point of view the above statement is not a gentle statement "already well-designed material is why you need to design again, what was the intention or meaning behind the word "well". Interpret it and rectify it.

Page 1, Comment No.4: Line no. 14 "Biomass based-plant....."
is also being a quotient for the readers, instead of that author can write it as "biomass and biomass-based plants"

Page 1, Comment No. 5: Line no. 26 "This tends to level down the electrical conductivity and its low energy density"
In this statement typos observed for the word "its low", Authors can write it as "This tends to level down the electrical conductivity as well as lowering the energy density".

Page 1 & 2 , Comment No. 6. Line no. 29 "remain environmentally impact."
For the reader's point of view the above statement is not a gentle statement so it correctly write as "remains the environmental impact"

Page 2, Comment No. 7: Line no. 33 "ion adsorption produced increased specific capacitance"
here also observed typos, so it can corrected it to write as "ion adsorption is responsible to increase the specific capacitance".

Page 2 , Comment No. 8 : Line no. 34 "the monolithic form shows a higher energy density than powder"
here also observed typos, so it can corrected it to write as "the monolithic form shows a higher energy density comparative to powder form."

Comments in "Materials and methods" section:

Page 2 , Comment No. 9 line nos. 74 to 75 "separated by a duck eggshell"
This is needful elaboration of the duck eggshell functioning for the reader's point of understanding. Why there is need to used duck eggshell?

Comments in "Results and discussion" section:

Page 3 , Comment No. 10 line no. 107 "macropose"
It is macro pore, there is a spelling error. So, spelling correction needed there to.

Page 4 , Comment No. 11 line no. 122 "44.512 - 45.612o "
The above range values and values given in Table no. 1 are not matched, need correction here also.

Page 5 , Comment No. 12 line no. 131 "3.6- 3.6"
The above range values and values given in Table no. 1 are not matched, need correction here also.

Page 5 , Comment No. 13 line no. 132 "3.461"
The above value and the value given in Table no. 1 is not matched need correction here also.

Page 5 , Comment No. 14 line nos. 147 to 148 "calcium (K)"

This is wrong name, The calcium column in given Table no. 2 is showed (K) , Need correction here also for the column title of column nos. 4 & 7.

Page 6 , Comment No. 15 line nos. 223 to 224: “specific capacitances remained at the level of 35%, 28%, and 35%, respectively, for ACM-0.25, ACM-0.50, and ACM-0.75”.

The author’s mention as 35 % value for ACM-0.75, but it’s not matched from the figure 4c (Graph).

Page 6 , Comment No. 16 line no. 231 “capacitance is 204 F g⁻¹ (ACM-0.50), followed by ACM-0.25 (162 F g⁻¹) and ACM-0.75 (37 F g⁻¹)”.

The author’s mention value 204 F g⁻¹ (ACM-0.50) and the value (162 F g⁻¹) ACM-0.25 that were not matched as per figure 4c.

Page 7 , Comment No. 17 line no. 246 “c) GDC profile of ACM electrode at a scan rate of 1 mV s⁻¹”

The author’s mention figure 4c title as “GDC profile of ACM electrode at a scan rate of 1 mV s⁻¹ But scan rates actually showed up to 10 mV s⁻¹ in figure 4c, So need to correct title of figure 4c.

Page 7 , Comment No. 18 line no. 246-247 “d) specific capacitances at various scan rate for ACM-0.50”

The author’s mention figure 4d title as “specific capacitances at various scan rates for ACM-0.50 only. But figure 4d showed specific capacitances for ACM 0.25, ACM 0.50 & ACM 0.75 respectively. Need to do correction in title of figure 4d.

Comments in the “Conclusion” section:

Page 7 , Comment No. 19 line no. 256 “specific capacitance of 204 F g⁻¹”

The value of 204 F g⁻¹ specific capacitance cannot reflected anywhere in graph.

The above 19 comments reported needs correction at authors level as earliest.

Reviewer I:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

Originality of the work

Excellent

Experimental design and methodology

Excellent

Adequacy of the discussion

Excellent

Technical accuracy

Excellent

Suitability of references

Excellent

Use of Tables and Figures

Excellent

Standard of English

Excellent

Clarity and conciseness

Excellent

Referee's Comments

Dear author:

The paper title "An Environmental Approach in Production of Activated Carbon Monolithic derived from Garlic Peels for Supercapacitor Application", has carried out detailed research on fabricating the activated carbon derived from garlic peels through chemical activating of potassium hydroxide under various concentrations.

The physical characteristic is studied using SEM, EDX, XRP, CV, GCD. The citations were made properly. Writings can be improved.

Walailak Journal of Science and Technology (WJST)

<https://wjst.wu.ac.th>

2020 SJR (SCOPUS): 0.146

7 lampiran



M-article (anonymous).docx

1259K



C-23986-WJST Template (Anonymized)-69712-1-4-20210913.docx

1245K



B-Review.docx

17K



F-REVIEW COMMENTS ON MANUCRISPT.pdf

307K



F-23986-WJST Template (Anonymized)-69712-1-4-20210913 with highlighted comments.docx

1261K



M-1-WJST-Template-2021 (1).docx

50K



M-2-WJST-form-Responses-the-Reviewers-Comments-2021 (1).docx

47K

[WJST] New notification from Walailak Journal of Science and Technology (WJST)

1 pesan

Sujinda Youngjeen <journal.wu@gmail.com>

25 Oktober 2021 pukul 12.51

Balas Ke: Editor of Walailak J Sci & Tech <journal.wu@gmail.com>

Kepada: Erman Taer <erman.taer@lecturer.unri.ac.id>

You have a new notification from Walailak Journal of Science and Technology (WJST):

You have been added to a discussion titled "[WJST] Accepted Manuscript ID 23986 to be published in Walailak Journal of Science and Technology" regarding the submission "An Environmental Approach in Production of Activated Carbon Monolithic derived from Garlic Peels for Supercapacitor Application".

Link: <https://wjst.wu.ac.th/index.php/wjst/authorDashboard/submission/23986>

Editor of Walailak J Sci & Tech

Walailak Journal of Science and Technology (WJST)

<https://wjst.wu.ac.th>

2020 SJR (SCOPUS): 0.146

[TiS] Your article has now been published online

1 pesan

Trends in Sciences (TiS) <journal.wu@gmail.com>

24 November 2022 pukul 21.57

Kepada: Erman Taer <erman.taer@lecturer.unri.ac.id>, Apriwandi Apriwandi <apriwandi95@gmai.com>, Widya Sinta Mustika <widyasintam@gmail.com>, Miftah Ainul Mardiah <miftahainul.mardiah@gmail.com>, Rika Taslim <rikataslim@gmail.com>

Dear Author,

We are pleased to inform you that your article has now been published:

The Trends in Sciences

Title: An Environmental Approach in Production of Activated Carbon Monolithic Derived from Garlic Peels for Supercapacitor Application

Author(s): Erman Taer, Apriwandi Apriwandi, Widya Sinta Mustika, Miftah Ainul Mardiah, Rika Taslim

We hope you will continue promoting your excellent paper in your academic social circles so that more researchers will be able to read it and consider our journal as a venue for future publications.

<https://tis.wu.ac.th/index.php/tis/issue/archive>

Thank you for publishing with the [Trends in Sciences](#).

Best regards,
Editorial Team

[Trends in Sciences](#)

Formerly know as [Walailak Journal of Science and Technology](#)

2020 SJR (SCOPUS): 0.146