

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_108283
Title of the Manuscript:	Solids Reduction Process for Agricultural Effluent – A Laboratory Feasibility Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>1. This manuscript is important for scientific community because is an interesting and up-to-date study regarding the possibilities of improving the quality of wastewater resulting from zootechnical activities, respectively reducing the content of solid substances. These waters will be used for irrigation.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient and recent.</p> <p>Pay attention to the numbering of paragraphs and sub-paragraphs, some are wrong. For all four aspects/processes studied (ph, conductivity, solids content and COD) a comparative analysis regarding the effectiveness of the use of the three substances as flocculants (calcium hydroxide, ferric chloride and aluminum sulfate) would be useful. A technical-economic analysis could also be done to optimize the expenses for these processes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English quality of the article is appropriate for scholarly communications, he presentation is clear and followable.</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:	Erika Beilicci
Department, University & Country	Politehnica University of Timisoara, Romania