

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.	This manuscript addresses an important aspect of wastewater remediation by comparing physical, chemical, and biological treatment methods. Its findings could contribute to sustainable practices in water management, particularly for developing countries. However, the manuscript requires significant improvement in methodology presentation and data analysis to ensure its impact on the scientific community	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable. However, if needed, it could be made more specific by including key variables or techniques, e.g., "Comparative Performance of Treatment Methods in Wastewater Remediation Using Moringa Extract."	
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 overly descriptive and lacks critical results and statistical interpretation. It should clearly highlight the findings, statistical significance, and relevance to current challenges in wastewater treatment. Suggestions: Revise the abstract to include key data points, results with statistical validation (ANOVA or T-test), and a concise conclusion.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript presents relevant experiments, but the data lacks proper statistical analysis (e.g., ANOVA or T-tests) to validate differences among treatment methods. Statistical validation is crucial for scientific rigor. Suggestions: Include statistical analyses in all results, and replot graphs using statistical software such as GraphPad Prism or SPSS for improved clarity and accuracy.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references include foundational studies but lack recent citations. Incorporating recent literature from the past 5 years will strengthen the discussion and contextual relevance. Like these papers that have shown it's novel effects Moringa oleifera L. leaf extract induces cell cycle arrest and mitochondrial apoptosis in Dalton's Lymphoma: An in vitro and in vivo study Synthesized Gold Nanoparticles with Moringa Oleifera leaf Extract Induce Mitotic Arrest (G2/M phase) and Apoptosis in Dalton's Lymphoma Cells Suggestions: Add recent articles addressing advanced wastewater treatment techniques or similar studies involving Moringa seed extract.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is too rough for scholarly communication. The grammar, syntax, and sentence structure require professional editing to improve readability. Suggestions: Seek assistance from a language editing service to enhance the academic tone and precision.	
Optional/General comments	The methodology is explained in detail but should be streamlined for clarity. Additionally, the discussion section needs deeper insights into the implications of the results, particularly regarding the combination of treatment methods.	

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:	Naveen Kumar
Department, University & Country	Raffles University, India