

Review of: "How to search for patents on the recovery of rare earth metals from electronic waste"

Sadia Ilyas¹

¹ Hanyang University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. In the present manuscript, the author M. Barbieri studied the analysis of rare earth metals' recovery from e-waste through the patent search using Orbit Intelligence database on the Espacenet, while a combination of keywords and classification codes were supplied as the input search. The reviewer could not understand the exact aim of this study. Was it to verify the database of Orbit or to present an alternative to google patent search engine or to determine the accuracy of the database search? It needs to be clarified in the introduction.
2. Table 2.: The author used classification code Y02W 30/82 for "Recycling of WEEE" to obtain the results. What if we replaced "WEEE" by "electronic waste" or "E-waste"? Can the same result be achieved?
3. Because "WEEE" and "e-waste" are simultaneously used terms in most of the cases, and the author used "electronic waste" in title and applied "WEEE" in the codes, makes it imperative to be re-checked.
4. Similarly "rare earth elements" and "rare earth metals" are used simultaneously. What effect can be using two different terms coded for C22B 59/00?
5. When this reviewer searched the keyword "recovery of rare earth metals from electronic waste" in google patents, a search result of 71,718 appeared. How does this author compare both results?
6. Discussion part is missing in the manuscript. It should be added without that how it can be considered as a scientific article?
7. Moreover, the author needs to present a good research hypothesis in support of the study conducted. For which, they should include more recently published articles to have a fair discussion rare earths and e-waste recycling.