



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_32421
Title of the Manuscript:	Design and Evaluation of Household Horizontal Slow Sand Filter
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 authors stated that the proposed household-scale HSSF is a low cost water treatment process, however, no economic analysis has been conducted. Kindly, remove this advantage, or perform an economic analysis, or add a reference for this information. Support and compare the performance of your treatment system with relevant HSSF of previous researches.	1. I don't think that we need a reference or any economic analysis in this regard. Because we already have stated it well in our manuscript. Firstly, we stated from what and how we made the tool. Then, we also have stated that nothing have been added in the filtration process, it's all natural and using locally available/cheap resources. So, these all are evidences for that. 2. We already have tried all our best to compare it with the available literature.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		