

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_112763
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of the Functional and Dimensional Characteristics of Two Drinking Water Treatment Plants: Goudel II and Goudel III, Niamey Niger
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>The manuscript is lack of scientific knowledge. The authors should more focus on the experimentation and results.</p> <p>Title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>No, the abstract should be re-write. Not exactly.</p> <p>The manuscript need many scientific corrections. It contains grammatical, scientific, alignment, spacing and many other mistakes.</p> <p>There is no recent references in the reference list. The authors are suggested to add recent work in the introduction part and should replace the older references.</p> <p>The manuscript is completely full of scientific, grammatical, spacing, and editing mistakes. The formatting of the manuscript should be re-checked. The results are not satisfactory and lack of novelty.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, the manuscript should be checked for the language/English quality, suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript can be considered for re-submission after Serious major revision.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rekha Sharma
Department, University & Country	Banasthali Vidyapith, India