

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	

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 manuscript is very important to the scientific community because it deals with waste water treatment, although the waste water treated can not be used for drinking and other domestic purposes. Therefore, the authors of this manuscript needs to tailor their discussion toward that aspect.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not appropriate because at the end of the research, there was no remediation of any kind. Instead the title can be: Comparative analysis of physical, chemical and biological treatment methods of wastewater in (the name of the locality should be mentioned here).	
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.	The abstract is poorly written and suggestions has been made for it to be re-written. The format should follow the worldwide accepted ways of writing abstract i.e little of introduction of the research, summary of the materials and methods used during the research with standard references, followed by results findings from the research, conclusion which is the highlights of the research and finally recommendations if there is any.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is, but the authors failed to relate their findings to previous or present studies whether to agree or disagree with the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	NO, most of the references used are out dated and old.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but the author needs to employ more of academic rather than spoken ones	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Mariam Abiola Akanbi-Gada.
Department, University & Country	Kwara State University, Nigeria