

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	

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>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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, provided that the authors address the issues raised below.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>See comments below.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>See comments below.</p> <p>No. See comments below.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language needs to be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In this study, the authors examined various physico-chemical parameters of wastewaters from three slaughterhouse facilities in Nigeria. The work needs extensive revision before possible publication. Detailed comments are as follows:</p> <p>1. Improve language throughout the text.</p> <p>2. Abstract:</p> <p>a) Remove pompous expressions like "the water of worthless value to humans".</p> <p>b) Provide information on the location and the activity (poultry?) of the slaughterhouse facilities.</p> <p>c) Remove "treatment" from the Aim as the treatment of slaughterhouse wastewaters was not in the scope of the work.</p> <p>3. Introduction:</p> <p>a) It is not clear what is the purpose of the paragraphs regarding illumination, ventilation, and personnel and operating procedures in this paper. They should be eliminated.</p> <p>b) Information about the composition of wastewaters released from slaughterhouse facilities around the world should be provided. Introduction is well below standards.</p> <p>4. Methodology:</p> <p>a) The location of the facilities should be pointed in the map of Fig. 1.</p> <p>b) Provide information on the activities and capacity of the facilities under study.</p> <p>c) Remove trivial information like "The pH is a measurement of the hydrogen ion (H+) concentration in the samples."</p> <p>5. Results and discussion:</p> <p>a) Pay attention to the decimal points in Table 1.</p> <p>b) It is not clear what is the Raw Effluent, xxx (RS1), yyy (RS2), and zzz (RS3). Why three receiving streams but only one raw effluent for three slaughterhouse facilities?</p> <p>c) There should be a critical presentation of the results obtained and comparison with previously published ones.</p> <p>6. Conclusion:</p> <p>Conclusions should be revised. Instead of general statements, present the most</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	important data obtained. 7. References: References should be improved and increased.	
--	--	--

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:	Stavros Pouloupoulos
Department, University & Country	Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan