



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2012_BJAST_2872
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Efficiency of Ateel Wastewater Treatment Station for Rehabilitation Improving the Water Quality and its Safe and Practical Application

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The paper structure needs to be reorganized as figures and tables must be integrated in the text. Some text is irrelevant to the context e.g. Lines 89 – 96 in the results are irrelevant to the results as it describes the problem background. Line 100-106 is rather material and methods rather than results. 107-112 lines are theoretical background on BOD analyses concept and not related to results. 140-120 are methods rather than results. Objectives of the study must be restricted to description of treatment quality. Rehabilitation of the plant can never be an objective of a study. The studies usually fill gap of knowledge to facilitate better decisions and planning.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The language of the paper needs to be reviewed. Some mistakes were noticed such as "areas" instead of "area" in line 37. "Consists of" instead of "Consists on" in line 77. Lines 81and 90 are other examples. Text in line 81 and 82 is repeated in the same paper.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper reflects significant topic as water shortage is critical issue in the area. The use of treated wastewater in agriculture is identified as one of the most promising solution. The study is well justified but does not have clear questions. The methodology needs to be further description. Results are very briefly presented and should be presented in better design. There was almost no discussion to link the results with international and nation standards.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Conclusion is very general and includes issues that were not handled in the methods or results. The social acceptance was not measured in the paper. However, the conclusion describes it as part of the paper findings.	
--	---	--

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmed A. Abu Shaban
Department, University & Country	Head of plant production and protection department, Faculty of agriculture, Al Azhar university- Gaza. Palestine