

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_96845
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF POLLUTANT DISCHARGE FROM SLAUGHTERHOUSES ON RECEIVING WATER BODIES
Type of the Article	Technical paper

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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>I consider that this article has important contributions such as: a) Sharing a methodology for evaluating environmental contamination, mixing field work, chemical analysis and statistical management of information.</p> <p>The title is consistent with the work developed</p> <p>The summary is understandable, but I consider it is long. I recommend structuring as a single paragraph</p> <p>The structure of this article is adequate</p> <p>In general I consider this paper is correct, with only minor observations that I add later</p> <p>Regarding the references, they are adequate. However, I recommend that in the introduction or analysis of results section, is convenient to add trace contamination data, in other places. It is suitable for comparison and help in understanding the problem</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Correct the temperature data in the third paragraph, fourth line 180oC), in the introduction section. The unit needs to be corrected (180°C). At the beginning of the methodology, section 2.1 is written in past tense, but later, sections 2.2, 2,3 and 2.4 are written in future tense. I consider it is convenient to write them in past tense. In section 3.1.1, it is convenient to add comments similar to those of 3.1.2 and 3.1.3, or one that makes sense to the information presented in figure 2 It is convenient to complete the information of analysis section, considering the data from the chemical analyzes. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, english language of the paper is suitable	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	To improve the quality of analysis section	

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:	Javier Páramo Vargas
Department, University & Country	Technological University of Leon, Mexico