

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Engineering Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JERR_100121</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of the efficiency of wastewater treatment plant in oil and gas firm in Eleme Rivers State, Nigeria.</b>
Type of the 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> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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>Yes. It addresses the key issue of environmental pollution coming from industrial discharge of wastewater. Assessing the efficiency of treatment is important to ensure environmental quality.</p> <p>Yes. The title clearly gives an indication of the content of the manuscript</p> <p>Yes, the abstract gives a general view of the purpose, methodology and findings of the study. However, the abstract could be shorter in length.</p> <p>General structure and subheadings of the manuscript are appropriate and make reading easier.</p> <p>Standard methodology was applied for determining the parameter levels and calculating the efficiency. Sampling was done using grab samples which gives a good situation of the waste water. An indication of the number of grab samples taken per location (duplicate, triplicate) will be useful.</p> <p>Referencing style is not consistent. Also, some more recent publications could be helpful.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, the English is appropriate	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript lacks a detail discussion of the results. What factors possibly account for these numbers, such as pH, Temperature of treatment??</p> <p>The authors seem to be considering the individual treatment units and their efficiencies. A statement of the overall quality of the Effluent(final discharge) and Influent will be useful. Also, what is the dilution ability of the receiving water body?</p> <p>It is also clear, especially for TSS that the raw water level exceeds that design specifications of the DAF unit. Is there a recommendation for the installation of other pre-treatment units to reduce the TSS level before entering the DAF unit?</p> <p>The recommendations are appropriate and in line with the findings of the research</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Melvin Guy Adonadaga
Department, University & Country	C. K. T University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Ghana