

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ AJARR _128358
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARING THE PERFORMANCE OF PHYSICAL, CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL TREATMENT IN WASTE WATER REMEDIATION
Type of the Article	Full Article

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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The author did not state the significance of the study to the scientific community. The research methodology is completely basic and really lacks any fresh input.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Not at all. A better suggestion based on what was done should just be: Physicochemical analysis of moringa seed extract on remediation of domestic waste water.	
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.	It was not. The abstract was more than 250 words. It should not include the entire method as it did here.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The results and the discussion was entirely lacking comprehensiveness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references were poorly written.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes it is.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The results and discussion should be re-written completely.	

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:	Adebisi, Quazim Babs
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Education Pankshin, Nigeria