

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>)

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	Abstract 1. Abstract should be one paragraph 2. there is a major grammar error that needs to be corrected 3. Abbreviation in abstract is recommended Introduction 1. Grammatical errors needs to be corrected 2. as much as possible, references cited should be recently published articles 3. the sentences are very long. make the sentences short. one sentence can't be a paragraph. Materials and method 1. instead of listing materials separately, show what materials you use while writing the method. Results and discussion 1. 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 Conclusion 1. Make your conclusion precise and summarize your result and finally recommend a research gap that can be filled with the next researcher Reference 1. Very small. You need to cite at list 50-60 articles 2. the reference style should be uniform	
Minor REVISION comments	Citation should be 50-60 for recent articles Grammar is very important	
Optional/General comments	If the manuscript is rewritten based on the comments, it can be published because the results are very good.	

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Solomon Tibebe Gebreabe
Department, University & Country	Addis Ababa Science and Technology University, Ethiopia