

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_122347
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Locally Sourced Adsorbents for Abandoned Gold Mine Wastewater Bioremediation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>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.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The mining process is necessary to develop any country. 2. Due to mining activities lots of pollutants come out which can be harmful to the Natural Environment. 3. Due to mining activities major problem is disturbance of the Ambient air quality in the nearby area and water contamination may be possible due to the mining activities. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>It should be in a single flow,</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>A copy of the Correction is enclosed separately</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It needs to be revised</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An article needs English language editing as there are lots of English language and typo errors present, kindly get it done through any English language editing services. 2. Specify the references of the analytical methods which are used during the experiments. 3. There is poor discussion and justification in the result and discussion section. 4. There is no specified contact timing with the adsorbent during the experiment. 5. If there is no availability of the limits of FEPA and USEPA for all the parameters then remove that column. 6. It is been observed that most (11) of the parameters (in both the sample collection sites) are out of range of the specified limits of the World Health Organization (WHO), that also more than 60 percent of parameters are much closer to the WHO limits, and that might be due to the experimental errors also. so properly justify doing all these Experiments. 7. The Experimental Data of the total Hardness with comparison to Calcium and magnesium hardness and Calcium and magnesium ions are not convincing Justify them properly. IPONDA site 	

Review Form 3

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:	K.B. Dhameliya
Department, University & Country	RK University, India