

Editor's Comment:

I apologize for my late response, thank you for your understanding.


The authors have made correction in accordance with the requirements of the reviewers, and in this aspect article Ms_BJAST_22618 can be published.

However, in my opinion, the article has a lot of substantive errors, it is not original research article, but only a technical note. The manuscript is part of the project and can be used only as a guide for designing. It does not contain any new features in terms of design or scientific solution of the problem. And even more, it were given incorrect assumptions in design, for example:

Line 374: The usual detention time is 5 to 10 hours. Actually maximum period of detention is 2 hours, moreover it is written in line 379.

Line 520: The optimum mesophilic temperature is about 29 ° C, this is not true.

In addition, the editorial form, is completely unreadable. Even in a technical note, does not provide formulas for calculating such obvious value as diameter, length, area, etc.,



For example: Diameter of sump well $\sqrt[3]{0.0134 \times 4} = 6.4\text{m}$.

Then, for example: Capacity of each pump = 0.0134 cumecs or 0.0134m³ / s, cumecs = (cubic meter per second) = m³/s, it is the same.

Line 305: Assume Darcy's friction factor = 0.04: hf = - - - 2.15 what is a mark, the same applies to other lines.

Line 406: What does it mean ?: Duration rate of Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) = 5 day BOD of 120mg /.

These are just some of the comments, In my opinion article requires extensive improvement.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Sylwia Myszograj
Professor,
Department of Water Technology, Sewage and Wastes,
University of Zielona Gora, Poland