



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_48874
Title of the Manuscript:	USE OF AQUATICPLANTS IN MINE WASTEWATER PURIFICATION
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>While I mentioned the major shortcomings in this manuscript in the 1st review round, I still see those shortcomings repeated the manuscript. Additionally, I see no answer to the comments stated in the first review round.</p> <p>While the reviewers spend time to read a manuscript and suggest comments merely to improve the quality of a manuscript, the authors are expected to consider the reviewers' comments and edit the manuscript accordingly. The authors have improved the manuscript to some extent, however, preparation of the manuscript is still very careless and presentation of results is not clear. While is work is interesting and I believe it deserves to be published, the authors need to carefully resolve all shortcomings in the manuscript.</p> <p>For example in the 1st review round it was stated that presentation of concentration unit in forms of "mg/l" or "mg / l" is not correct and the authors must use the correct format of "mg/L", other than Table 1, all concentration units throughout the manuscript are not correct.</p> <p>The authors must address all review comments in the first review round and additionally address the comments in the second review round in a point by point manner.</p> <p>1-Please use the correct decimal point for representation of numbers < 1. For example, the correct value is "0.05" not "0,05".</p> <p>2-Please use the English translation of the word "Показатели" in table 3.</p> <p>3- "Materials and methods" Typo</p> <p>4-Please change "Results and its discussion." To "Results and discussion"</p> <p>5-Add year 2015 to the dates in (or the correct year) to dates in Table 1, otherwise the readers might think it's been a multiple-year study</p> <p>6-Did you take a single sample and kept it from May 10, 2015 until September 7, 2015, or you took 3 different samples for each experiment? Please add appropriate sentences to the manuscript to clarify.</p> <p>7-In results and discussion you've mentioned that "On the 3rd and 4th day, the roots almost completely died, the leaves turned pale and necrotic areas were observed on their edges (5-7 days after plant transplantation)." but Table 2 shows a continuous growth which contradicts this sentence. This is critical and needs to be clearly addressed.</p> <p>8-what were the dimensions of the aquatic plant's container? What was the surface area of</p>	



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

the container? Authors have just indicated to the volume (10 L) of the container.

9-What were the initial masses of each plant species at the beginning of the experiments? Authors have mentioned 300 -1000 g/m² while the surface area is not clear.

10-The growth rates in Table 2 seem to be very high. What was the initial mass? Do you have any photos from aquatic plants at the beginning and the end of experiments to support Table 2? If so, please add to the manuscript.

11-It is not clear that the results presented in Tables 3 and 4 belong to which month. Are Table 3 and 4 results of experiments in May or June or September or the average?

12-Removal efficiencies for removal of water contaminants by the aquatic plants in 10-day period seems to be very high. The authors must justify their results and relate the removals to the initial mass of the plants

13-How could you ensure that all removed contaminants were uptake by the plants and did not precipitate during the treatment period. In other words, the authors need to determine the contribution of plant uptake in the removal process.

14-While the added discussions to the conclusion are useful, the conclusions section should be brief with no additional citations. The authors have cited references 15 and 16 in conclusions which is not conventional. Please move the discussions from the conclusions to results and discussions and only keep the take-home message in the conclusions.

15-“mg O₂ / l” is not correct, please use the correct form of “mg O₂/L)” make sure that 2 must be subscripted.

16-In addition to the changes in the manuscript, the authors must answer to the review comments of the **1st and 2nd** review rounds **“in a point by point manner.”**

Reviewer Details:

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