

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_74658
Title of the Manuscript:	MODEL DEVELOPMENT FOR RESIDUAL CHLORINE
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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>(1) In abstract section, letters and formulas should not appear in the abstract section, the summary should be written in the order of purpose, method, result and conclusion. Language expression of the abstract should be concise.</p> <p>(2) In keywords section, how can EPANET 2.0 become a keyword?</p> <p>(3) In introduction section, references of this paper are quite old and the number of references is too small, in addition, the format of references is also not uniform. Please refer to and quote research literatures in recent five years.</p> <p>(4) In introduction section, for background of the study, the author lists the existing research, what's more, the author should comment on the existing research and points out its shortcomings.</p> <p>(5) In 2.0 Materials and methods chapter, no material information can be seen, please change the title of Chapter 2.</p> <p>(6) In 3.1 Residual Chlorine Mathematical Model Computation and Results, Why are there question marks in the explanation of letters?</p> <p>(7) There is a big problem in the sequence number arrangement of the chapters of the whole article, for example, There are two sections 4.1 conclusions, it must be modified.</p> <p>(8) For all tables in the article, analysis depth of table data is not enough, In addition, there is too little quantitative analysis and comparative analysis of the data.</p> <p>(9) In chapter 4.0 Conclusions and recommendations, sequence number of conclusions is inconsistent. In addition to the research work carried out in this paper, the conclusion needs to point out the innovation of this research, the research results and the significance of the research results.</p> <p>(10) The table in an article has different shading colors. Please unify the style of the table.</p> <p>(11) There are many problems in the format of the whole article, such as lack of full stops, grammatical errors, tense errors and so on.</p> <p>(12) What problems does the article solve? What is the innovation? What is the significance of the study?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	None	
Optional/General comments	None.	

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:	Hongwei Wang Guangxi Xinfazhan
Department, University & Country	China