

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Energy Research and Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JENRR_87805
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of a Sludge Blanket Reactor for Effluent Treatment - A Laboratory Study
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.journaljenrr.com/index.php/JENRR/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	<p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Abstract should be one paragraphthere is a major grammar error that needs to be correctedAbbreviation in abstract is recommended <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Grammatical errors needs to be correctedas much as possible, references cited should be recently published articlesthe sentences are very long. make the sentences short. one sentence can't be a paragraph. <p>Materials and method</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">instead of listing materials separately, show what materials you use while writing the method. <p>Results and discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">you need to refer to a lot of related articles and cite them. Your reference in this section is very small. you need to compare your result with others <p>Conclusion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Make your conclusion precise and summarize your result and finally recommend a research gap that can be filled with the next researcher <p>Reference</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Very small. You need to cite at list 50-60 articlesthe reference style should be uniform	<p>Authors feel Abstract is fine with paragraphs, it separates the findings better.</p> <p>Grammatical errors have been corrected.</p> <p>Authors feel that Abstract should not contain abbreviations. (Maybe ScienceDoamin team should make a decision on this generally. Some reviewers want it some not. This should be added to the journal template.)</p> <p>Grammatical errors have been corrected.</p> <p>We feel older articles should be mentioned too. Much work has been done in the past.</p> <p>We tried to do this.</p> <p>Authors feel materials used need to be listed separate. That makes it much clearer.</p> <p>This research has been done on a newly developed laboratory system. And can not be related to other results.</p> <p>Authors feel conclusion is a nice narrative of the project. Recommendation has been added.</p> <p>We feel the citation are enough. We did not write a review paper. Reference style was checked for Journal template recommendation and adjusted if needed.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Citation should be 50-60 for recent articles</p> <p>Grammar is very important</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>If the manuscript is rewritten based on the comments, it can be published because the results are very good.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	