



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_48874
Title of the Manuscript:	USE OF AQUATIC PLANTS IN MINE WASTEWATER PURIFICATION
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	<p>The subject is interesting but the article is entirely to resume:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The summary is very short and poor whereas according to the instructions to the authors it can contain up to 300 words and should contain: Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of Study, Methodology, Results and Conclusion. - The author did not respect the structure proposed in the paper template: 1. Introduction, 2. Material and Methods, 3. Results and Discussion, 4. Conclusion. - In the first page, line 15- line 27: there are no references. - In the first page, line 28:scientists of our republic...: Which republic? - References must be numbered in the order that they appear in the text whereas in this article the first reference cited is [7]. - In the second page, material and methods section should be subdivided into the following second level subheading: Wastewater samples, plant materials, Mine wastewater purification and statistical analysis. - In the second page, in Mine wastewater purification subheading, give details and add photos of the experiment for each plant species studied. - In the second page, line 21-line 31: there you have to write a paragraph. - You did not mention in material and methods that you performed a variant with the undiluted wastewater while you presented this variant in the results! - In page 3, line 11: indicators of sewage vary by seasons...: to say that it varies, it is necessary to ANOVA! You said that you used SPSS in hardware and methods but it does not show in the results (this remark is valid for the entire text). - Page 5, line 11: other hydrochemical indicators of wastewater are significantly reduced: which indicators? Indicate the p-value (this remark is valid for the entire text). - In tables 3 and 4: there are chemical elements that are represented twice (in Table 3 and in Table 4) and in two different units such as Ca, Mg, k, Na: it would be better to combine Tables 1, 3 and 4 to be able to compare and eliminate redundancies. - The discussion is poor or even non-existent. - Page 8, line 15-line 20: these findings should be mentioned, studied and developed in the results and not mentioned for the first time in the conclusion. - The references did not respect the journal's style of reference. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In table 1: initial water, dilute water: the study is conducted on wastewater and not water (this remark is valid for the entire text). -The decimal numbers are written in English with a dot. - In table 3: what "Показатели"? Use English. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - English with which the text is written is poor, it should be improved. - Explain abbreviations when you use them for the first time and also in tables. 	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nidhal Marzougui
Department, University & Country	National Research Institute for Rural Engineering, Tunisia