



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_12572
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Rice Husk as Water Treatment Agent and Soil Amendment
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	• Title of manuscript – consider substituting “soil amendment” with “soil conditioner”. • Section 2.5 line 101 says the planting media was sand and topsoil at a ratio of 3:2. Substitute “sand/ topsoil” in the abstract and experimental section and tables with “planting media” as it does appear that neither sand nor topsoil were used in the study on their own. • What is the cost to the farmer of buying treated rice husk for application on an acre or hectare of land? • A factorial design of the experiment instead of one factor at a time would have been more appropriate.	• Changes made as suggested. • Changes made as suggested. • At this stage, it is yet too early to conclude the cost necessary for application on an acre of land as further evaluation is required to suggest the optimum rate of application considering different soils system and plants. However, the production cost is estimated at USD30/kg. • It is added in the manuscript, Line 95-99, “The optimization may be alternatively performed based on full factorial designs. The design



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• What is the meaning of the letters a,b,c,d in tables 1 and 3 (on the standard deviations)? It doesn't look like the experiments were replicated.	inherits several advantages over the traditional one-factor-at-a-time approach. It is relatively cheaper and less time consuming. In addition, the interaction between factors can be systematically evaluated permitting more efficient optimization [14]. • For the optimization study, each evaluation was performed in triplicates. This is clarified in Line 91, "The dosage, contact time and flow rate were optimized using a one-factor-at-a-time approach, with six replicates for each experiment." • For pot trials, it is stated in Line 108-109, "<i>Brassica juncea</i> var. <i>rugosa</i> L. were planted into six treatments each with six replicates." • The letters a,b,c indicate the significant difference in mean absorbance (for Table 1) and growth parameters (for Table 3) for different treatments. This is explained at the footnote of each table. Measurements noted with same letter suggests no significant
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		different.
Minor REVISION comments	Line 184 – change “prominent fractured” to “prominent fractures” Line 250 – change ‘hence enhance” to “hence enhancing”	Changes made as suggested. Changes made as suggested.
Optional/General comments	The research is interesting and technically sound.	