



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_7625
Title of the Manuscript:	SPECTROPHOTOMETRIC DETERMINATION OF PHYTASE HYDROLYSABLE PHOSPHORUS (PHP), TOTAL DISSOLVED PHOSPHORUS (TDP), FILTERABLE REACTIVE PHOSPHORUS (FRP) AND DISSOLVED ORGANIC PHOSPHORUS (DOP) IN NATURAL WATERS
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	Title: The title as it is makes the work very unnecessary. In addition, the title does not really capture the aim of the work and therefore must be modified. Abstract: this must be modified in line with the comments made on the body of the work. Introduction: A lot still has to go into the introduction as the authors did not really justify the work enough. Methods: the method is lacking in clarity and organisation. In addition, there seems to be a gap in the method as some of the issues mentioned in the methods have no bearing with the results. Results and Discussion: the inclusion of a calibration curve in the result is not important at all. In addition, there is basically no discussion. The authors simply wrote down the result and quoted another author as if the other author(s) did the work. That has to be corrected Conclusion. This will follow from the discussion. Others: the results do not have any form of comparison with each other i.e. items in the result. There is no standard deviation. We cannot say a particular stream is better than the other etc.	Title: The title of the work has been adequately modified to reflect the type of research done. Abstract: The Abstract has also been modified to reflect the changes made in the body of the work. Introduction: The introduction section has been extensively revised including the addition of more literature review to justify the work done. Methods: The methodology section has also undergone major revisions to make the technique used clearer. I also want to point out that this is a novel research as there seems to be little or no studies in this area in Nigeria. Results and Discussion: The calibration curve has been removed from the work as suggested. I agree that it has no bearing on the results. The results and discussion section has been totally revised to make it more extensive. Explanations of results and comparison with results of similar research in this area were also done. All areas pointed out for corrections were done. Conclusion: The conclusion has also been revised.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	I suggest the authors take a very close look at the PDF copy of the manuscript which I made several comments on. It will help guide them to adequately make the necessary corrections.	I have made all the necessary corrections which you pointed out. All corrections are highlighted in yellow colour.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Frankly speaking there are too many holes in the work.	I have made an extensive revision of major sections of the manuscript and also added more references to improve the overall quality of the work (All corrections are highlighted in yellow).