SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_51403
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF MORINGA OLEIFERA AS WATER CAOGULANT ON THE PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES OF GULBI-WATER
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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)

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Grammar is exceedingly poor - submit to a reputable proof-reading agency	
	Crammar to executingly peer calabilities a repartable preer reading agency	
	 ABSTRACT Start with problem statement sentence (What led to this investigation?) "30.4 to 33.8 oC – where is the temperature information in the results section?) There were 6 treatments + 1 control – you cannot just indicate ranges – rather indicate just most outstanding results overall For additional issues refer to the accompanied annotated manuscript. 	
	 introduction introduction<	
	 MATERIALS AND METHODS 9) For section 2.1.1 [There cannot be a 2.1.1 without first a 2.1 – as 2.1.1 is a subsection of 2.1] 10) Collection of water sample: "Water samples were collected according to the method of Francis and Amos [5] with modification [indicate modification]. Plastic kegs of 2 litres (in other places it is written as liters – inconsistency – check and correct throughout paper) capacity were used to collect samples for physico-chemical parameters, while two kegs of 10 litres capacity were used to collect samples for laboratory-based filtration experiments. Thoroughly washed [indicate type of water used to wash – distilled or tap or de-ionised?] and sterilized glass bottles were used to collect samples for bacteriological analysis, while plastic sample bottles (PTFE) of 60 ml capacity were used to collect samples for [heavy metal analysis – where is the heavy metals results presented?]. The samples were collected by submerging the containers into the water body" – [indicate depth at which water was taken] – indicate water conditions (e.g. slow flowing or fast flowing water, near the river edge or at centre of river etc. etc.] [Indicate time of day water was taken, indicate if river was in flood or not etc. etc.]. [Upstream or downstream of riverine human settlements] [how far from a human settlement – what do the settlement use the water for? Etc etc.] [a full description of the river conditions must be presented] 11) Determination of turbidity: "The initial turbidity was measured 3 times on the raw water while stirring [indicate speed or stirring]," 12) Any modification must be explained, why there was a need to modify a standard method, and what the modification entailed. 13) Total Bacterial count: "Average bacterial count from the triplicate plates was taken, and the bacterial content of the water was recorded from the known dilutions and 	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

	14) For additional issues refer to the accompanied annotated manuscript.	
	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
	15) First write a paragraph on the results obtained, wherein the Table is mentioned,	
	then place the Table. Thus paragraph-figure, paragraph-figure, paragraph-figure,	
	paragraph-figure etc.	
	16) Table 1: Results obtained for the MPN [write out this abbreviation]	
	17) THERE ARE JUST TOO MANY ISSUES TO INDICATE HERE - refer to the	
	accompanied annotated manuscript.	
	REFERENCES	
	18) Many inconsistencies	
	19) Not in accordance with journal guidelines	
Minor REVISION comments	10) Not in accordance with journal galacinics	
MINO NE VIOLOTO COMMICILIS		
Ontional/Conord comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

		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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martin Potgieter
Department, University & Country	University of Limpopo, South Africa

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)