



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_54205
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFICIENCY OF RICE HUSK BIOCHAR AND CONVENTIONAL WATER TREATMENT METHOD TO REMOVE CHLORPYRIFOS FROM PESTICIDE POLLUTED WATER
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>

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>Major grammatical errors and sentence structure issues need to be fixed and resolved.</p> <p>In one table, there is shown a probability value of 0.05. Yet, there is no mention or graphical representation of any kind of statistical analyses performed. It would seem that a Student's t-test would be ideal to compare treatment means and reinforce the results.</p> <p>Standard deviations are fine, but a letters report denoting significant differences is more visually effective.</p> <p>Do not embed graphs and tables with the text. When one part of a sentence continues under a graph, it is difficult to keep up with the reading. Make the text and graphics separate, but adjacent.</p> <p>Make the graphs/charts larger (difficult to see axes) and reformat some of the tables to be consistent throughout the paper.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Avoid using an asterisk (*) when referring to something in a table, graph or text. This could be confused with multiplication. There are many other symbols to choose from in Word.	
Optional/General comments	Despite some of the grammatical and formatting issues, this is an interesting paper which could have profound impacts in waste water management and environmental stewardship. I would be extremely interested to read any follow-up investigations by these authors. In addition, the author's use of the provided journal template should be recognized and appreciated.	

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:	James Burke
Department, University & Country	University of Arkansas United States of America