

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	MS_IJECC_84271
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficiency of Vetiver zizanioides and Vermiculite in Coir Wastewater Treatment
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I really appreciate what this research group has tried to do; it is a very interesting problem. The aim of this work is clear but the methodology and the results found to need great improvement. The manuscript describes the treatment of some pollutants parameters in wastewater like COD, BOD... .</p> <p>The title "Efficiency of Vetiver zizanioides and Vermiculite in Coir Wastewater Treatment" is irrelevant and doesn't match with the experimental results. However, the methodology and the discussions are described with enough details, also it's not very clear. After reviewing your paper I feel that it is not suitable for publication in this journal in this actual state.</p> <p>In the following some detailed remarks to:</p> <hr/> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In 3. results and discussion I think the authors forget this paragraph from the template: "The discussion should not repeat the results, but provide detailed interpretation of data. This should interpret the significance of the findings of the work. Citations should be given in support of the findings. The results and discussion part can also be described as separate, if appropriate."2. In the results and discussion part; try to start with a relevant paragraph then "The measured values of pH...."3. Also, use just the abbreviation of "Electrical conductivity (EC), Total dissolved Solid (TDS), Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD), Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD)" and try to put it in the abstract.4. Please start with figure 1 then 2.5. Add some comparison results study and other updated references. The most recent cited reference is "Almeida A, Ribeiro C, Carvalho F, Durao A, Bugajski P, Keirelc K, Pochwatka P, Jozwiakowski K. Phytoremediation potential of Vetiveria zizanioides and Oryza sativa to nitrate and organic substance removal in vertical flow constructed wetland systems. Ecological Engineering. 2019: 138: 19-27". And we are in 2022.6. Add references: "Coconut palm is an important Karnataka (18.9 %), Tamil Nadu (17.7 %), and Andhra Pradesh (5.5 %) which together account for 91 % of India's coconut growth."7. Respect the same form of number after the point 27.8% cellulose, 28.5 % lignin and 8.128. Add a schema for the treatment process.9. In table 1: how you can explain the efficacy of your process? The initial pH is neutral then after treatment it become acidic. <hr/>	
Minor REVISION comments		

Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
---------------------------	--	--

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Belbahloul Mounir
Department, University & Country	University Hassan First, Morocco