

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_95647</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>BIO-COAGULANTS FOR THE REMOVAL OF METALS FROM DAIRY WASTEWATER INDUSTRY</b>
Type of the 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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Importance:</b> The study was aiming to evaluate the use of ecofriendly alternatives such as neem tree leaf and banana leaf powders as natural coagulants for the treatment of dairy effluent. They used levels of turbidity, sodium (Na), potassium (K), calcium (Ca), barium (Ba), lithium (Li), and copper (Cu) as an indicator for the treatment efficiency.</p> <p>2. <b>Title:</b> Clear to a certain extent but preferred to be more concise as follows <b>"Biocoagulants as Ecofriendly Alternatives in the Dairy Wastewater Treatment"</b>.</p> <p>3. <b>Abstract:</b> Clear to a certain extent. Some modifications were recommended to enhance the readability and understanding.</p> <p>4. <b>Structure of the manuscript:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Keywords:</b> Please rearrange in alphabetical order.</li> <li><b>Introduction:</b> Clear to a greater extent and properly arranged. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding.</li> <li><b>The aim:</b> Clear to a certain extent. Some modifications were suggested to enhance readability and understanding.</li> <li><b>Materials and methods:</b> Please notice the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No ethical approval and considerations were provided.</li> <li>Provide the model and manufacturer of the grinder, flame photometer, UV-Vis Spectrophotometer, and the turbidity meter.</li> <li>The authors did not provide the statistical analysis, a reference, and the statistical model used for the analysis.</li> <li>Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> </ol> </li> <li><b>Results:</b> The results are novel, clear to a greater extent, and informative. Some modifications that were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text and some abbreviations have to be fully introduced.</li> <li><b>Discussion:</b> Clear to a great extent with moderate comparison and moderate speculation. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li><b>Conclusion:</b> Clear to a certain extent. Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li><b>Tables:</b> Well-presented and organized.</li> <li><b>Figures:</b> Well-presented and organized.</li> </ol> <p>5. <b>Scientific Soundness:</b> The manuscript holds a wonderful idea that can be applied in the field of water and wastewater treatment.</p> <p>6. <b>References:</b> MUST BE UPDATED as zero% (0 out of 16) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The percentage has to increase to 30-40%. The old reference indicates less interest in the study field.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p><b>General view:</b> The manuscript was written in a moderate English and grammar. Some copyediting and proofreading have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve the publishing value.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) No ethical issues are listed or pointed to in the manuscript.</p>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Essam Samir Soliman
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt