

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_125838
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on the effectiveness of livestock wastewater treatment using chemical coagulation method
Type of the Article	Experimental Research

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Importance: Livestock waste water when unhandled goes to nearby stream contaminating the existing water body and also contaminates the ground water too, hence treatment of livestock waste water is essential everywhere. I Like the manuscript because here the simple and popular method of chemical coagulation is used for treatment and research	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Scientifically robust and technically sound manuscript Because – experimental method, analytical method and data processing method is well defined, clearly mentioned and utilized for research. Experimental Observations were taken, Comparison with Standards is carried out, good results are obtained	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Sufficient references	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes OK.	
Optional/General comments	Simple English is used. Good Manuscript	

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:	Pravin Khandve
Department, University & Country	Prof Ram Meghe College of Engineering & Management, Badnera-Amravati, India