

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_89707
Title of the Manuscript:	Vetiver Floating wetlands for Dyeing effluent
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Original Research Article Vetiver floating wetlands for dyeing effluents</p> <p>In my opinion, it is an interesting proposal, innovative due to the use of low-cost natural resources, it does not require a well-equipped infrastructure and state-of-the-art technology. The local knowledge of the properties of the bioremediation plants that they possess, are a viable alternative in the solution of local, national and international problems. Since water is a vitally important resource in the life of the population, but increasingly, it is more limited and also contaminated by anthropogenic activities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vetiver is an alternative for bioremediation or phytoremediation of effluents, for countries with limited economic resources. This plant species was initially used to protect the soil against erosion processes. However, other properties have been discovered in bioremediation. 2. In the summary it is reported that the effluents were diluted to different concentrations, namely, 25%, 50%, 75% and 100%. Explain in methodology if the dilution was made with distilled water or ordinary water?. 3. The sampling method, describe the techniques of 0, 15 and 30 days. Results It is reported that the 50% dye effluent showed better results than the floating vetiver wetlands. Doubt arises if there were two experiments, clearly explain the dye effluent and vetiver 4. The removal efficiency was higher at the 50% concentration. What was removed? explain 5. The summary must be clear, precise and concise. 6. Materials and methods Justify why the experiment was performed in April and May? In these months the effluents have a higher concentration of contamination, or what is the justification? Describe in a simplified way, size of vetiver plants before subjecting them to hydroponics? And during hydroponics, what height did they reach? Explain if there were two experiments in the effluents, one with dyeing and the other with TDS? It would be interesting to indicate the daily temperature, or monthly average and humidity during the development of the experiment, these elements are important, both for vetiver and the behavior of effluents. Explain in the hydroponic system, if the plants received oxygen and oxygenation techniques. <p>Experimental setup</p> <p>He mentions nine strips of vetiver, which corresponded to one repetition each?, if the teacher was random in the vetiver plants?.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>The Hogland solution at what concentration (CE) was prepared in d S/m and application techniques to the vetiver crop?</p> <p>Wonder if Hogland's solution was used only for vetiver growth before being introduced into the polluted effluent?</p> <p>During the sampling, time zero, 15 and 30 days, the sampling had repetitions?.</p> <p>The disinfection of the material with acid, what kind of acid do I use?</p> <p>It is interesting that the statistical techniques used for data analysis are indicated.</p> <p>7. Table 1, physical-chemical analysis I think it would be interesting to incorporate a column of optimal ranges of the properties to compare with the results and make decisions.</p> <p>3.1 There was no discussion to indicate the initial characteristics of the effluents to support the reported data, that is, initial characteristics, time zero.</p> <p>The comparison of the characteristics of the parameters are reported, but the discussion is limited, suggestion to integrate a discussion that supports the data,</p> <p>The solubility of many dangerous compounds and heavy metals is influenced by the pH of the water, which heavy metals, mention how the pH influences the solubility, that is, under what pH ranges does it occur, in acids, neutral or alkaline, technically support this affirmation.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>It is an interesting investigation, due to the use of natural resources of the region, it does not require a well-equipped infrastructure and they are of low economic costs.</p> <p>Review the tables and make a good discussion of the results. It is an interesting investigation, due to the use of natural resources of the region, it does not require a well-equipped infrastructure and they are of low economic costs.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I believe that the data obtained in the samples, if it had been analyzed with a statistical tool, the output of the machine would have given better results and interpretation and make the best decisions</p>	

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ricardo González Mateos</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Autonomous University of Guerrero, Mexico</p>