

Review of: "Experimental Behavior of Solar Still Using Mixed Oxides Mn-Fe/Silicon Resin Composite as Selective Solar Absorber"

Mohamed A. Dahab

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title: Experimental Behavior of Solar Still Using Mixed Oxides Mn-Fe/Silicon Resin Composite as Selective Solar Absorber

The paper seems unclear. There are some comments that should be responded to or recommended for publication.

1. The highlight section should be updated with meaningful sentences.
2. The current literature review in section 1 is more like a summary of the key findings of previous research. Please provide a critical literature review by highlighting the research gaps of previous research works and highlighting the importance of addressing the research gaps.
3. The quality of both language and organization can be improved by proofreading by a native English speaker or proofreading service.
4. This sentence should be improved; Australian type solar stills are not common in solar desalination. Among the main designs, single-slope solar stills, in the form of a house (also called Australian or two-slope), can be found.
5. Please provide a conceptual graphical abstract including the main findings of the work.
6. The introduction section is too short; update references related to solar distillation, such as

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2022.116276>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.137431>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsep.2023.101922>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsep.2021.101144>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2022.01.023>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2021.08.105>

1. The novelty in the introduction section is not clear.
2. The figures in the research do not have units such as Fig. 7, which must be updated.
3. Add a figure that investigates water productivity.
4. All equations should be properly referred to (mentioned) in the text before appearing.
5. Deep and mechanistic discussions are required to explain the obtained results.
10. The obtained results have not been sufficiently compared with the published data. Please add a table in the

"Results and discussion" section to address this issue.

Discussions have not been well supported by proper references.