



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_31499
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of sand and wood chips in tertiary treatment of effluent discharged by lagoons
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	1- The manuscript needs to be reviewed by a proof reader. The manuscript does not read smoothly. The language of this manuscript has to be improved. Some sentences are hard to understand, and some sentences are not professional. 2- In the introduction section the novelty/important of the research work should be more highlighted. For enriching the introduction section a well-rounded literature study should be done. Through adding new literatures, the references section would be enriched. 3- The explanation of Sand and Wood chips (2.2.2.1, 2.2.2.2) and their importance should be in introduction section. The similar work should be mentioned by literature study. 4- Section MATERIALS AND METHODS are written poorly. It should be include the sub-sections of The characteristic of inlet wastewater, Chemicals (with name of company) and instrumentation (with model and country), Pilot plant setup, Start-up and acclimatization, Operational procedure, Wastewater sampling and analysis (here, the method of Bacterium identification should also explain), and Statistical analysis (formula used for calculations). Pilot plant setup section should include a Figure as Schematic diagram of the systems with dimensions that are	1- The manuscript has been read and corrected by a specialist in English. 2- The introduction has been reviewed and improved! 3- Wood chips (wood fibers) and sand were mentioned in the introduction 4- Methods of analysis, sampling and analyzes carried out on wastewater were specified. In addition, the statistical method used for the analysis of the results was clarified, as was the method of bacterial identification. A schematic diagram of the pilots was given with the dimensions of the different layers.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	used. The Operational procedure should include the "Experimental conditions". This should consists of Operation period (day), HRT (hours), Q (L/day), OLR based on COD and BOD, and HLR. 5- The section of results and discussion is better to combine. The Section of Results only presented the Table (i.e. Table 3). In this table only should presented the effluent concentration (mg/L) of Sand filter and Wood ship Filter and there percentage removal efficiency. The Raw water characterization, sampling number and National standards should explain in the section of MATERIALS AND METHODS. The result should be explained. Only table is not enough. The concentration of Physico-chemical and biological parameters at influent and treated effluent during operational period (3 months) should also present. This could useful to readers and other researchers in understanding of the associated phenomena. 6- Author only discussed and evaluated the parameters such as NH_4^+, TSS, BOD5, COD. What's about the phosphate? 7- Pre-estimated capital costs associated with the construction filters for 1 m3/d influent should be as a table presented and discussed. Moreover, this estimation should compare with other reported literatures. 8- The reference should be updated. At least 50% of references should above 2012.	5- The results and discussions sections have been combined. Percentage of removal efficiency, raw water characterization, sampling and national standards were explained and reported in the materials and methods section. 6- Orthophosphate are present in very small quantity compared to the rejection standard. It does not present any major risks. However, their contents in the wastewater were given. 7- We have not been able to estimate the cost of the technology at this stage. This will be done later when we will work on a larger scale. 8- References have been updated.
--	--	--