Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JGEESI_45596**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Kinetics of Nitrate Removal from Bed Column**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**It is suggested some modifications of the text to improve the manuscript.** **In the INTRODUCTION:** It is necessary to cite some manuscripts already published within the same theme of study. I suggest that in the introduction the equations are not placed, just to mention the models. Cite the equations in the methodology. At the end of the introduction put the aim of this research work. Make Equations in Microsoft Equation. **Carefully inspect the description of the units of the equations. See paper already published in this journal.** **Check all units carefully throughout the text, except for the % symbol, the other units must be separated from the numerical values.** **In the MATERIALS AND METHODS** Adjust the sub-items. See manuscript. DOI: 10.9734/JGEESI/2017/37283 Various information is needed, such as the study site. Cite the equations in the methodology. More details as variables were obtained. **In the RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** The quality of the figures is not good. The titles of figures and tables need to be standardized. See in this manuscript the correct form. DOI: 10.9734/JGEESI/2017/37283 **In the CONCLUSION** The conclusions should be better, because here is basically the description of the results already described above.	1. Some manuscript with theme of study has been cited 2. Equation in introduction had been removed and cited in the methodology. 3. The aim of the study had been effected at the end of introduction. 4. The units had been separated from the numerical values 5. Correction has been effected in Materials and methods 6. The study site Kwata slaughterhouse is on the methodology 7. Correction on conclusion has been effected
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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