



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_9887
Title of the Manuscript:	Coag-flocculation approach to removal of colloidal particles from brewery waste water using okra seed extract
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>)



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	I think the manuscript is interesting and could be published after a general review. The weakness of the manuscript is the lack of discussion of their results. Results and discussion section is only an exposition of results. I think that authors should discuss their results based on the general principle of comparing their results with previous research. Discussion of results should be included. Section 2.1 could be interesting but citations are needed. Please include the citations of the formulas.	(All corrections are highlighted in red color) Thank you sir for the comments. Reviewer 4 and 5 made the same comment. The corrections has been done in lines 133-139. In section 2.1 citation of the formulas has been done in line 50.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript has severe problems with the conversion from the text processor to the PDF file (or otherwise). I highlighted a lot of portions of the manuscript (comments in a PDF) where two words were united and must include a space. Also, other sections of the manuscript should omit spaces, subscripts were omitted, etc. Include the scientific name (Genus species, Authority) the first time Okra was cited. You could also include the scientific name in the title of the manuscript. I suggest the fusion of figures 1-5 into a block of plots for a better visual comparison of dosage effects. Check the references guidelines because some manuscripts include the name of the article (e.g., [1]) and other manuscripts omitted that information (e.g., [9]).	All the comments in PDF has been corrected and highlighted in red color. The scientific name of okra is included in the title of the manuscript. The comment made on the references as regards the name of articles and omission of information, has been done and highlighted with red on lines 277-278.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		