



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_11049
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthesis and Glass immobilization of carbon and nitrogen doped TiO ₂ -SiO ₂ and its effect on E. coli ATCC 25922 bacteria
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	References are not in same order or poor arrangement. Because, the title of the references missing in some references for ex. Ref No 8, 15, 16, and 17. In 140 th line, author mentioned carelessly mentioned Fig 3 instead of Fig 5 , so correct the Figure number.	Thank you for the comments. The reference titles have been added and Fig 3 changed to Figure 5.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Nice piece of work was carried out by authors. But some minor revisions were required to increase the clarity of manuscript. Authors compared the antibacterial activity of Carbon and nitrogen doped nano-composites with unmodified TiO₂. the aim of the work is study the antimicrobial effect of photocatalysts of TiO₂-SiO₂, but the results shows powdered TiO₂ have the high effective against E. Coli. In this section the discussion is not enough. Finally, in conclusion section the use of photo-catalyst in future aspect was missing. So add the novelty of their works in conclusion section	Authors appreciate the good comment on work done. The essence of the study was to establish how effective TiO₂ was on bacterial inactivation when immobilized and not necessarily compare performance with unimmobilized TiO₂. The main point was to address post-recovery of spent TiO₂, while maintaining effective levels of antimicrobial activity. Doping of TiO₂ was carried out to improve spectral response. It is acknowledged that glass is not a good immobilizer. Authors have addressed this issue by adding relevant information to the conclusion.