



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	2014_JAERI_15583
Title of the Manuscript:	Wastewater Management using an aquatic and semi-aquatic plant species, Cattails (<i>Typha domingensis</i>) and Duckweed (<i>Lemna (polyvia)</i>)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	Review on Paper entitled " Wastewater management using an Aquatic..." ID: 2014_JAERI_15583 <u>General:</u> The text require an English language polish (other comments are given in the chapter of "Specific Comments". <u>Specific Comments:</u> Correct the cases of two words attached without needed space. <u>Abstract</u> Line 6: originate is better than is waste water and domestic better than household Line 8: system replace mechanism Line 9: densities replace concentrations Line 11: remove at least and insert one or more wetland trials. Line 12: insert Absorption and uptake or incorporation Line15: replace have by presented. <u>Introduction</u> Line 21: insert include effluents Line22: replace wastewater by excretions and contain residuals of urine Line 23: delete bits of. Insert ...amounts of decomposed organic matter and Line 28: Reference is needed for 50% of P from wastewater. Replace are popular for by enhance Line 29: Change: A report (2010) on wastewater Line 30: Ref. is required for...Guyana...	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 33: Change: was spread by flood waters Line 34: Change: Pathogenic microorganisms were recorded in urine... Line 35: North-West...of which country? Line 36: this study are: 1)...to test... Line 37: replace single by solely combination by combined: 2) to ...and 3)to Line 39: replace related by potential human ... Line 43: replace environmental conditions by environment Line 44: replace compartmentalized by construction with.. Line 45: replace insulated by insulation. Line 46L Typha domingensis space Line 48: Typha and Lemna are not of the same size Line 50: replace built by constructed. Line 64: Total 4 samples? No duplicates? Line 68 P is probably TP? Line 71: Fecal Coliform counts Line 74: Replace introduced to by distributed over Throughout the entire MS (text & Tables) each number of different parameters should be accompanied by units Table1: Explanation for the DO decline? Potassium is not P but K. 3 in NO₃ is low script. Is it the case that cattail absorb P and Lemna not? What is the source for Na increase in CH₂ & CH₃? Does SO₄ absorption by Lemna is higher than that of Cattail. Is it possible that Lamna in constructed wetlands prevent DO diffusion? Table 2: suggestion, Table 3: add S for significant and NS for not significant. instead of bolding use symbol of minus(-). Line 122 : In table 1 Nitrate results are ND so far how you indicate the high absorption affinity/ explain!	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 123: replace higher end by peak. How ND nitrate cause Lemna mortality, no other nitrogen source? Lines 130 & 131: what is positive and negative? Line 127: How 0% decline if in Table 1, 1.67 ppm is given? Line 140: replace dying by degraded matter of dead plant tissue. Give one time in the text: CFU (Colony Forming Unit) Table 5: Replace No Significant by Not Significant. Clear concluding remark is outcomes: Constructed Wetlands remove suspended particulate matter but not Fecal Coliforms. The term presented as "aquatic environment" in the conclusion must have an explanation. Line 186: Table 5 indicate that it is not significant therefore this remark I cannot be accepted.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Previously given	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Gophen
Department, University & Country	MIGAL-Scientific Research Institute, Kiryat Shmone, Israel