



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	Original 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. The coverage of this article is limited to merely filtered sample while the original sample composition is silent. It brings difficult on the assessment of method performance. 2. Number of samples involved is not clearly mentioned thus brings the question of validity. 3. No citation on the methodology part thus the procedures are not known to be author invention of standard procedures.	The number of samples, including the original (pre-filtered) water is included under table-5. And, the methodology is a combination of what we found from the literature and our own methods. So, we have cited what we found from the literature and our own should remain our own.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. References are too old in such it brings the question on when was the study done. 2. There are unnecessary photos and procedures explanations which add no value in this article, thus may be deleted (line 161 to 218)	The unnecessary photos are already deleted. Thanks for that!! However, the old references were very useful in our work. They were very important in designing our own methodology. So, we cited them accordingly. But, the work was done this year.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Limited data/information and citations makes this article lack strong impacts.	