SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_48476
Title of the Manuscript:	Design of Domestic Sewage Treatment System Based on Programmable Logic Controller
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

	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	This manuscript presents a method for automatic control of a wastewater treatment system using PLC. The manuscript is overall clean and well-written. However, this manuscript does not present any results related to the application of the proposed system. Considering the fact that nowadays most wastewater treatment systems work in an automatic manner and human manipulation is minimal, the authors need to provide some results showing the application of their proposed method. The authors need to explain that: How this proposed system can results in an improved wastewater treatment? What are the advantages of the proposed system compared to other automated systems? Does this system result in a more stable treatment efficiency? Does the proposed system result in a decreased failure rate? Do you any numerical results? The current form of the manuscript resembles a design manual for a treatment system rather than a research manuscript. Hence, the authors need to add some numerical results to compare their proposed method to other systems commonly used in wastewater	
	treatment plants.	
Minor REVISION comments	1-Don't use contractions such as SBR, I/O in the abstract 2-Introduction: "However, in recent years, the water source caused by environmental pollution has become increasingly worse. Therefore, it is urgent to improve the environmental pollution" Please rewrite for clarification. 3-Treat the word wastewater as a single words not two words 4-Figure 2: use "treated wastewater" instead of "The water" for the SBR reaction pool's effluent 5-Section 3.3.4: "but the deficiency of the aerator in the use process can not be ignored." Typo: cannot 6-Page 14, line 2: "When the start sment pool." The sentence is incomplete. 7-Page 14, line 5: "the catchatchment pool rises to the upper limit set by the program" Do you mean catchment pool? 8-Introcuation and conclusions need to be improved. Compare your research with the current state of the art in this area. 9- The Figures are overall understandable, but some of them need some cleanup work. There are some overlapping of texts in some Figs. and parts of the texts out of their related boxes in some flowcharts.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ali Saber
Department, University & Country	University of Nevada, USA

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