



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_26840
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of drinking water treatment process by modeling the aluminum sulfate dose
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper requires being restructured. In the methodology section is required an explanation of how contributions are categorized and how the model is evolving from the simplest one (M1) to a complex one (11). I suggest to split the plots 6 and 7. The overlapping of lines make unclear the differences between each model After line 131 the material corresponds to results and it is not part of the methodology Discussion of why M5 is the best (lines 171-173) is considered poor, also from plots it is not evident that really M5 is the best approach The conclusions section is poorly discussed, it should remark findings and contributions of this approach and methodology applied	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Figure 4 legend it should be choride not chlore Line 36 reference [9] is written twice Line 44 it should be follows Line 177 it should be are continually	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Margarita Teutli León
Department, University & Country	Engineering, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla (BUAP), Mexico