

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102488
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of filter beds-filter beds and macrophytes in a vertically constructed wetland for treating domestic sewage effluents
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The study has scientific importance and great applicability in the field of environmental sanitation.</p> <p>2. No. Review the title. I think there is redundancy in the words: filter beds-filter beds (and in the manuscript).</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. Yes. Revise: The anonymous authorship of the references must be reviewed. There is a proper way to cite.</p> <p>Additional suggestions: Many points in the manuscript must be improved:</p> <p>The specific objectives of the study should be rewritten to improve the understanding of the experimental design. A hypothesis must be indicated.</p> <p>A more specific description of the analytical methods would be of interest to the reader.</p> <p>Considering that the manuscript did not present the specific objectives clearly, the conclusions of the study were impaired. After rewriting the objectives, the authors should point out the conclusions and refer to the objectives.</p> <p>In my opinion, the section entitled Novelty and Impact of Study should be incorporated into the manuscript (one part in the introduction and one in the conclusion).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but proofreading of English writing must be done on the entire manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcela Bianchessi da Cunha Santino
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de São Carlos, Brazil