

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_81790
Title of the Manuscript:	Seeds of Citrullus lanatus (Thunb.) Matsum. & Nakai, Vigna unguiculata (L.) Walp. and Zea mays L. : chemical characterization of the coagulating solutions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 13, point 3.3.2. "Comparative study of coagulant activity": It needs to be corrected. You indicate that these results are shown in figure 4, however this figure shows other results. The exposed results are observed in figure 5. 2. Page 16 and 17: At the "Conclusion" section, I suggest correcting and verifying the numbering that appears both in this section and in the entire content of the work, because some references are double-numbered. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Maintain the same type and size of letter in all the writing of the abstract, and all the work. 4. Page 1: You could consider this as your keyword: coagulating solutions. 5. Page 1: I suggest mentioning whether or not the coagulant activity was favourable for the water clarification goal in your earlier investigations. 6. Page 2: Consider authorship data for the <i>Moringa oleifera</i> taxon, to bring a uniformity of data in relation to the others taxa mentioned at the beginning of the work. 7. Page from 2 to 5: At the "Material and Methods" section, I suggest to include, in addition to the brands, the models of equipment used to obtain and evaluate objectives (each point in this section that uses equipment). 8. Page 13: I suggest verifying the minimum doses for <i>C. lanatus</i> and <i>V. unguiculata</i>, because the figure shows us minimum data from the curve at 5000 mg / L. 9. Page 15, point 3.4. "Statistical analysis": I suggest that the reason and purpose of the results obtained be explained and indicate if there are previous works in which results similar to those obtained in this work have been obtained, for discussion, comparison and relationship with the objectives. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. The "Introduction" section includes the problem and its relationship with the object of study; In addition, it exposes the antecedents related to the subject, its importance and the justification for the scientific problem that the work presents. 11. The "Material and Methods" section presents a high level of suitability in relation to each detailed point and to the technical standards of the methods. The work provides sufficient details of the methodology used, allowing other researchers to reproduce the experiment described. 12. The "Results and Discussion" section includes the results obtained from the application of the methodology set out above, presented in tables and figures, which are correctly interpreted. It explains and interprets in detail and supports the results obtained, contrasting them with other results obtained by other authors in previous works, based on literature related to the topic of interest. 13. The "Conclusion" section includes information based on the data obtained, which had support and was discussed within the work. 14. The "References" section includes bibliography and relevant and adequate scientific literature, which is related to the topic. 15. In the original document of the complete manuscript, I have considered including comments about compulsory revision and minor revision, in the places where the observations were made, so that the author can quickly identify them. 	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Victor John Acedo Zegarra
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional De Trujillo, Peru