



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_49450</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Application of Moringa in the Removal of Salts from the Desalinator Reject</b>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. In Abstract, the authors have mentioned that “seeds with crushed or ground Moringa husk are equally effective at adsorbing sodium from...”. But the fact is that in case of sodium, adsorption was found to be 98.7% while for Ca, Mg and Cl, adsorption was 11%, 1.7% and 1.8%, respectively. How were Ca, Mg and Cl adsorption effective?</p> <p>2. Abbreviations were written as CCI for whole seeds with husk, CCT for crushed seeds with husk and so on. The abbreviations are not in line with the elaborated form. It is difficult for the readers to understand such abbreviations. If possible, authors may change the abbreviations.</p> <p>3. It is not clear whether or not all the adsorbents were prepared with 14 mesh. The particle size of the adsorbents should be well defined.</p> <p>4. In page 3 (Result and discussion), authors have written the following sentence: “It was observed that the contact time did not significantly modify the pH in the samples tested, but, specifically...”. It is not clear that what sort of modification of pH is necessary.</p> <p>5. Style of referencing in the text is not right in some cases. For example in page 5 the authors wrote “Research carried out by [7] showed...” Or “According to [8], in a comparison...”. In such cases, authors should check the referencing style of the manuscript and should write accordingly.</p> <p>6. Fig. 3 shows that husk of Moringa plays a crucial role because adsorbents prepared with husk are seemingly ineffective for adsorption of Na. Authors have not explained why husk plays such an important role for adsorption.</p> <p>7. All the experiments have been carried out for 30, 60, 120 and 180 min only. Did this time facilitate a complete adsorption? If complete adsorption was done, the proof of complete adsorption should be mentioned in the manuscript.</p> <p>8. In all figures and table, authors have used “comma”. Does it mean a “decimal”? If so, decimal should be written everywhere instead of comma.</p> <p>9. All figures are not of same size and shape. For example, Fig. 6 and 7 are small while Fig. 4, 5 are larger. Figures should be consistent throughout the manuscript.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Biplob Kumar Biswas</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Jashore University of Science and Technology, Bangladesh</i></b>