



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_42791
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Effectiveness of Cassava Wastewater Treatment in a Low Cost Microbial Fuel Cell
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	Abstract: 1) The abbreviation BOD₅ and COD must be written in full. 2) to standardize litres, use only L (upper case) 3) to separate the number/value of the unity in all text 4) to observe the use of comma in all text 5) pages no were numbered 1. Introduction: 1) Page 1, line 15 – [all the references in text must be between brackets] 1) Page 1, lines 15-19 – put reference. 2) Page 1, line 20 – explain 268 Tg??? Incomplete phrase 3) Page 1, lines 31-33 – put reference 4) Page 1, lines 34-39 – put reference 5) Pages 1,2, lines 39-43 – put reference 6) Page 2, lines 44-45 – repeat words, remove 2. Experimental Procedure: 1) Page 2, line 86,106 and 121 – I suggest changing Plate 1 by Figure 1. 2) Page 2, line 95 – idem, change & by and. 3) Page 3, line 99 – 60 g of Agar agar (agar powder)??? 3. Results and discussion 1) Page 4, Table 1 – I suggest to use the medium values (A1+A2 and B1+B2) more standard-deviation. 2) Page 4 – I suggest to use other technique, as chromatography to confirm all the obtained values 3) Page 5 – The caption of the Figure 1 is poor, improve. 4) Page 5 – In the Figure 1 – pH parameter not appears... Why??? 4) Page 5, lines 194-199 – standardize hours or minutes, use one or the other. 5) Page 5, line 214 - eternal resistance??? 6) Page 5, line 201-203 – excess of dots??? 7) Page 6, line 234 – 0.116 - value without unity. 8) Page 7, lines 272-279 – remove y= of the equations 3, 4 and 5. 4. Conclusion 1) Page 7, lines 294-296 – phrase confused, rewrite it.	BOD and COD written in full in the abstract. However, it has been written in full when it was first mentioned in line 40 Litres as L effected in line 2 of the abstract Units separated Commas were used as appropriate Page Nos. inserted Introduction All references inserted into the appropriate bracket, line 15,23,27,28,33,36,42,52,53,56,59,65,98,99 etc 268 million tons of cassava ,line 20 Ref. inserted in line 33 Ref. inserted in line 36 Ref. inserted in line 42 Repeated word- sedimentation removed line 44-45 Methods Plate 1 changed to Figure 1 in line 85, 94, 105, 113 and 120 & , changed to and as shown in line 94 Yes , 60 g of agar powder Results Values added to give mean values Caption of Figure 1. Improved to 'Percentage Removal Efficiency for selected parameters' The figure represented only selected parameters All values changed to minutes as shown in line 192, 194, 195 and 196 External resistance line 212 Dots removed 0.116 volts Y = removed as shown in line 270, 273 and 276 Sentence reframed in line 291 - 292
Minor REVISION comments	No comments	
Optional/General comments	Congratulations! This paper is good, present innovation trends; however is need to verify the language, because some phrases are confused and difficult to be understood. The results are promising.	Thanks for painstaking and good observations.