

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_103810
Title of the Manuscript:	Treatment of Effluent with an Anaerobic Aerobic Effluent Treatment System
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is important. Waste treatment producing biogas can reduce dependence on fossil fuel. 2. The title is suitable. 3. The abstract is comprehensive but there are many keywords. The author should comply with the journal's guideline. 4. Yes. 5. Yes. 6. The references are sufficient and recent but the author should study the guideline and comply with them. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Grammar and structure of statements are the major problems. The work is probably from graduate research. The supervisor should go through the manuscript.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Some comments and suggestions are made on the manuscript. There are more mistakes that should be corrected. 2. Three different feeds were run through the treatment plant at different times. The author did not write about changeover protocol. Was the system cleaned after a run to avoid the contamination of the following run? 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adeyinka O. Fasakin
Department, University & Country	Ekiti State University, Nigeria